

**A Commentary
on the General Instruction
of the Roman Missal**

A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal

Developed under the Auspices of the
Catholic Academy of Liturgy and Cosponsored by the
Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions

Edited by

Edward Foley
Nathan D. Mitchell
Joanne M. Pierce

Foreword by the

Most Reverend Donald W. Trautman, S.T.D., S.S.L.
Chairman of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy
1993–1996, 2004–2007

A PUEBLO BOOK

Liturgical Press

Collegeville, Minnesota

A Pueblo Book published by Liturgical Press

Excerpts from the English translation of *Dedication of a Church and an Altar* © 1978, 1989, International Committee on English in the Liturgy, Inc. (ICEL); excerpts from the English translation of *Documents on the Liturgy, 1963–1979: Conciliar, Papal, and Curial Texts* © 1982, ICEL; excerpts from the English translation of *Order of Christian Funerals* © 1985, ICEL; excerpts from the English translation of *The General Instruction of the Roman Missal* © 2002, ICEL. All rights reserved.

Libreria Editrice Vaticana omnia sibi vindicat iura. Sine ejusdem licentia scripto data nemini licet hunc Lectionarum from the Roman Missal in an editio iuxta typicam alteram, denuo imprimere aut aliam linguam vertere. Lectionarum from the Roman Missal in an editio iuxta typicam alteram—edition iuxta typica, Copyright 1981, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano.

Excerpts from documents of the Second Vatican Council are from *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents*, edited by Austin Flannery, © 1996 Costello Publishing Company, Inc. Used with permission.

Cover design by David Manahan, OSB. Illustration by Frank Kacmarcik, OblSB.

© 2007 by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegetown, Minnesota. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, microfilm, microfiche, mechanical recording, photocopying, translation, or by any other means, known or yet unknown, for any purpose except brief quotations in reviews, without the previous written permission of Liturgical Press, Saint John’s Abbey, P.O. Box 7500, Collegetown, Minnesota 56321-7500. Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A commentary on the general instruction of the Roman Missal : developed under the auspices of the Catholic Academy of Liturgy and co-sponsored by the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions / edited by Edward Foley, Nathan D. Mitchell, Joanne Pierce ; foreword by Donald W. Trautman.

p. cm. — (A Pueblo book)

ISBN-13: 978-0-8146-6017-1

1. Catholic Church—Liturgy—Texts—Rubrics. 2. Catholic Church. General instruction of the Roman missal. 3. Missals—Texts. 4. Lord’s Supper—Catholic Church—Liturgy—Texts. 5. Mass—Celebration. I. Foley, Edward. II. Mitchell, Nathan. III. Pierce, Joanne M. IV. Catholic Academy of Liturgy. V. Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions.

BX2015.3.C66 2008

264'.02036—dc22

2007030130

Contents

Foreword by the Most Reverend Donald W. Trautman	vii
Introduction	ix
Abbreviations and Acronyms	xiii
<i>Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani</i> and the Class of Liturgical Documents to Which It Belongs	1
<i>Nathan D. Mitchell and John F. Baldwin</i>	
Liturgy and Ecclesiastical Law	28
<i>R. Kevin Seasoltz</i>	
Theological and Pastoral Reflections	46
<i>David N. Power and Catherine Vincie</i>	
Preamble	73
<i>Margaret Mary Kelleher</i>	
Chapter I: Importance and Dignity of the Eucharistic Celebration	99
<i>Keith F. Pecklers</i>	
Chapter II: The Structure of the Mass, Its Elements and Its Parts	113
<i>Edward Foley</i>	
Chapter III: The Duties and Ministries in the Mass	199
<i>Bruce T. Morrill and Susan K. Roll</i>	
Chapter IV.I: The Different Forms of Celebrating Mass	224
<i>Martin Connell and Sharon McMillan</i>	
Chapter IV.II: Concelebrated Mass	279
<i>Gilbert Ostdiek and Andrew Ciferni</i>	
Chapter IV.III: Mass at Which Only One Minister Participates	310
<i>Mary Shaefer and Joanne M. Pierce</i>	

Contents

- Chapter IV: Some General Norms for All Forms of Mass 325
Mary Shaefer and Joanne M. Pierce
- Chapter V: The Arrangement and Furnishings of Churches for the
Celebration of the Eucharist 351
Mark E. Wedig and Richard S. Vosko
- Chapter VI: Requisites for the Celebration of Mass 383
Richard E. McCarron and Anne C. McGuire
- Chapter VII: The Choice of the Mass and Its Parts 405
Joyce Ann Zimmerman
- Chapter VIII: Masses and Prayers for Various Circumstances and Masses
for the Dead 423
Joanne M. Pierce and Richard Rutherford
- Chapter IX: Adaptations Within the Competence of Bishops and Bishops'
Conferences 447
Mark Francis and Gary Neville
- List of Contributors 468
- Index 471

Foreword

The celebration of the Eucharist is the sacred action of Christ and his people. Through the centuries the Church has reformed and regulated, restored and refocused the way of celebrating Eucharist. The *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, authorized by Pope John Paul in 2002, represents the latest effort of the magisterial office of the Church to guide and govern eucharistic ritual.

The *General Instruction* forms the preface to the Roman Missal and not only contains the rules and rubrics for the celebration of the Eucharist but also expresses the Church's understanding of the Mass. This document offers new insights and new emphasis; it corrects and updates previous general instructions. It seeks to restore the eucharistic rites to ancient norms.

To grasp the deeper meaning of liturgical rites and norms, a commentary is essential. To grasp the pastoral, catechetical, and theological implications and nuances of the *General Instruction*, a commentary is essential. Liturgical norms and guidelines by themselves do not convey their full rationale or historical background. Only a studied analysis can produce the proper perspective and theological insight necessary for a comprehensive understanding.

This present commentary represents the best in liturgical scholarship. It answers a critical need for a detailed study of the *General Instruction*, explaining its pastoral and theological dimensions, especially its ecclesiological implications, in view of contemporary issues. Each chapter shows how eucharistic ritual has developed and adapted to changing cultural circumstances, while preserving its innate Catholic tradition and the biblical teaching on Eucharist. The editorial team, headed by Edward Foley, O.F.M. Cap., has assembled liturgical scholars representing the Catholic Academy of Liturgy and the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions. These scholars offer a balanced, reliable, and unparalleled resource for all who seek a deeper understanding of the celebration of the Eucharist. No single liturgical viewpoint can ever express the full mystery of the Eucharist. Varying viewpoints give us a broader and deeper comprehension of ritual reform.

The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* gives us appropriate guidance for judging the directives of the *General Instruction*:

Pastors must therefore realize that, when the liturgy is celebrated, more is required than mere observance of the laws governing valid and licit celebration. It is their duty also to ensure that the faithful take part knowingly, actively, and fruitfully. (no. 11)

These words of the council fathers frame the approach of this commentary. Rubric literalism is never the goal. Pastoral prudence and the spirit of liturgical law must prevail. The “more” the council fathers mention is the goal.

We can understand our eucharistic celebration only if we know the meaning of the eucharistic ritual. Recall the principle: *lex orandi, lex credendi*. What we pray is what we believe. The rule of prayer is the rule of belief. Bows and genuflections, the use of incense and sprinkling with holy water, posture and gestures, singing and silence, processions and presenting gifts—all have doctrinal implications. The liturgy is catechesis. This commentary explains the relationship between ritual and doctrine.

The last *General Instruction* was issued in 1975 shortly after the end of the Second Vatican Council. Many new Church documents have been promulgated since that time, including the Rite of the Dedication of a Church and Altar (1977), the Code of Canon Law (1983), and the Ceremonial of Bishops (1984). These major documents had a direct bearing on the celebration of the Eucharist and hastened the most recent revision of the *General Instruction*. The changes in the Roman Missal as reflected in the *General Instruction* must be seen as something more than a refining of rubrics. These changes must lead to a new commitment to foster full, conscious, and active participation in the Mass. Celebrating Eucharist can never be reduced to a mere enacting of rituals. Some rubrics stress the role of the clergy; other rubrics emphasize the role of the assembly. The GIRM in paragraph 18 stresses that full, conscious, and active participation in the Mass is “demanded by the very nature of the celebration, and to which the Christian people have a right and duty by reason of their Baptism.” These are strong words reminding us that all the baptized followers of Jesus share by varying degrees in his priesthood. The Mass is the action of all the members of the assembly, including the priest celebrant and other liturgical ministers. Liturgical laws must never “clericalize” the lay participants.

Transformation is the goal of all liturgical celebration. We must always have before us the ultimate questions: Has the renewed liturgy renewed us? Have the revised rites and liturgical norms led to a transformation of people?

Too often rubrical changes have been viewed as only surface remodeling of our eucharistic celebration. This commentary dispels that notion, penetrating below the surface to give the full context and offering us pastoral, catechetical, and theological insights into the source and summit of our Christian lives.

Most Rev. Donald W. Trautman, S.T.D., S.S.L.
Bishop of Erie
Chairman of the Bishops’ Committee
on the Liturgy, 1993–1996, 2004–2007

Introduction

Liturgical renewal is an ongoing process, more energetic at some points in Christian history than in others. The year 2008 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the election of Blessed John XXIII, and the beginning of the most recent active renewal period. These liturgical reforms, supported by the intensive historical and textual research of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and sparked by the publication of the Vatican II constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (SC), reached a kind of crest with the first edition of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (IGMR) and the *Missale Romanum* (MR). This first wave of liturgical reform after Vatican II brought momentous change to the Eucharistic liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church, but it was not in any sense the last word. In fact, later editions of the IGMR and MR continued to elaborate and refine the post-conciliar celebration of the Eucharist.

The publications of IGMR2002 and MR2002 mark the crest of a fresh wave, a significant moment in the flow of Roman Catholic liturgical life at the turn of the new millennium. Based on the experience of thirty years of “living in and through” the liturgical reforms of Vatican II, and grounded in further study and reflection, the directives and insights presented in IGMR2002 are symbolic of contemporary developments in pastoral practice and theology, as well as symbolic of some of the past tensions that continue in the dynamic of liturgical reform. Therefore, IGMR2002 needs to be understood as an ecclesially potent document that should be read not only from the viewpoint of liturgical history, theology, and practice, but also through other key “lenses” of the contemporary period, e.g., ecclesiology, Christology, missiology, and theologies of inculturation. In this commentary, the primary “lens” for reading this new edition of IGMR is SC itself, which provides the guiding hermeneutic for understanding and crafting the Church’s worship.

Against the backdrop of these observations, the goals of this commentary can be understood more clearly. The first goal is to set IGMR2002 in context; thus, the first three essays presented in the volume offer an historical, a theological, and a canonical introduction to the document. The next goal, to provide careful analysis of the text of the document itself, is realized through the design of the rest of the volume, which provides specific theological, historical, and pastoral commentary on each chapter and number of IGMR2002. The third goal concerns the future of the document; this commentary is offered not only to enhance understanding of the current IGMR2002, but also to anticipate future directions. This is the fifth IGMR (and the third MR) to be published since 1969,

Introduction

and Catholics will undoubtedly see further editions in the years and decades to come. Clearly, there has been enormous development and improvement through the various stages of *IGMR*, and we expect that to continue in subsequent editions. In some small way, we hope that this commentary contributes to the fruitfulness of that future development.

This commentary was prepared primarily for those in positions of leadership in the Church. We hope that bishops, teachers of liturgy, members of diocesan liturgical staffs, pastors, and those who exercise other roles of ministerial leadership in liturgy will find this volume a rich source of historical background and contemporary theological reflection to assist them in their work. At the same time, we have tried to make the commentary an accessible resource for others interested in learning more deeply about the liturgy, especially students engaged in more formal study; thus, while offering a commentary on the official Latin text of *IGMR2002*, we have also provided translations of texts and other tools to assist a wider range of readers.

Because of the liturgical and ecclesial significance of *IGMR2002*, this project has deliberately been a collegial one from the beginning. Therefore, the organization of this volume was undertaken by the members of the Catholic Academy of Liturgy (CAL), an association of Roman Catholic specialists in liturgy, music, art, and architecture; the organization is connected with the ecumenical and interfaith North American Academy of Liturgy, composed of liturgical specialists active in the United States, Canada, and other western countries. Three members of CAL served on the editorial board for the commentary, with Edward Foley serving as overall director. The authors contributing to the work were also drawn largely from its membership, and CAL as an organization serves as one cosponsor of the project. However, from the start, this project was not designed to be a purely academic exercise, but one generated from the meeting of scholarship and pastoral concern; the editors and authors are active in teaching, ministerial training, and pastoral leadership as well as liturgical scholarship.

The second cosponsor of this project is the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions (FDLC), the professional organization for members of Roman Catholic diocesan Liturgical Commissions and Offices of Worship in the United States. The FDLC understands its more general mission as one of support for all those engaged more generally in the liturgical apostolate. Their commitment to this project springs naturally from their deep concern about the importance of having a strong resource work, grounded in careful scholarship and pastoral reflection, that will aid pastoral leaders in understanding and interpreting *IGMR2002* to the benefit of their worshipping communities.

In keeping with this pattern of professional collaboration, the writing of the commentary itself was collegial. The volume contains the work of twenty-five contributors. The work of all the authors, including that of the editors, was continually placed in dialogue with that of the other contributors. Insights from

one author have often influenced the writing of other sections, and sometimes material originally written for one chapter has even been moved to a more appropriate location. In this way, while composed of the work of individual specialists, this volume also reflects the work of a community of liturgical scholars and practitioners.

We would like to express our gratitude to the various authors whose articles appear in this commentary. In addition, we would also like to express our gratitude to other contributors: to J. Michael Joncas, who shared in the early work of the editorial team; to Gilbert Ostdiek, OFM, Mary Collins, OSB, and Bishop Donald Trautman, each of whom read various sections of the commentary and offered comments and suggestions; to the leadership of CAL and FDLC who spearheaded the cosponsorship of this volume; and finally, to Peter Dwyer and our collaborators at Liturgical Press, for their great interest in the project, unflagging support through the writing and editing of the work, and careful professionalism in bringing it to publication.

The liturgical reforms of Vatican II and the books that resulted from them and give form to our twenty-first century worship, have been inspired by the principle articulated so clearly in *SC*, no. 14, full, conscious, and active participation by the laity. This luminous vision, already widely embraced, animates every edition of the *IGMR* and beckons us further into the mystery of Incarnation, Eucharist, Church, and Mission. As Augustine of Hippo preached one Easter to the neophytes and the faithful:

“You are there on the table; you are there in the chalice. You are this body with us, for, collectively, we are this body. We drink of the same chalice because we live the same life.” (Sermon 229)

Edward Foley
Nathan D. Mitchell
Joanne M. Pierce
7 March 2007
Feast of SS. Felicity and Perpetua

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAS	<i>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</i> (Rome: 1909 to present)
AG	<i>Ad Gentes</i> , Vatican II “Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church,” 1965
Appendix1969	1969 Appendix to the General Instruction for the Dioceses of the United States
ApTrad	Apostolic Tradition
BCL	Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy of the USCCB
BLS	Built of Living Stones: Art, Architecture, and Worship, issued by NCCB/USCC (now USCCB), 2000
<i>Book of Blessings</i>	Approved for use in Dioceses of the United States by the NCCB, 1987
Bugnini	Annibale Bugnini, <i>The Reform of the Liturgy 1948–1975</i> , trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990)
c., cc.	canon, canons
ca.	<i>circa</i>
CDF	Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
CDWDS	Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments
C.E.	Common Era
CEC	<i>Catholicae Ecclesiae Catechismus</i> , 2nd edition (<i>editio typica</i>), 1997
<i>CaerEp</i>	<i>Caeremoniale Episcoporum</i> , 1984
ch., chs.	chapter(s)
<i>ChrDom</i>	<i>Christus Dominus</i> , Vatican II “Decree concerning the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church,” 1965
CIC1917	<i>Codex Iuris Canonici</i> , 1917
CIC1983	<i>Codex Iuris Canonici</i> , 1983
d.	died
DOL	International Commission on English in the Liturgy, <i>Documents on the Liturgy 1963–1979: Conciliar, Papal, and Curial Texts</i> (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1982). All numbers refer to the marginal numbers running sequentially throughout that volume.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

DPPL	Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy, issued by the CDWDS, 2001
DV	<i>Dei Verbum</i> , Vatican II “Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation,” 1965
EACW	Environment and Art in Catholic Worship, issued by the BCL, 1978
<i>EccMys</i>	<i>Ecclesia de mysterio</i> , issued by the Congregation for the Clergy and seven other dicasteries of the Holy See, 1997
GCE	Guidelines for Concelebration of the Eucharist, issued by the USCCB, 2003
GDC	General Directory for Catechesis, issued by the Congregation for the Clergy, 1997.
<i>Gelasianum</i>	<i>Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae Ordinis Anni Circuli</i> (Vat. Reg. lat. 316), ed. Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, <i>Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Maior, Fontes IV</i> (Rome: Herder, 1960)
GIRM1970	ICEL translation of <i>IGMR1970</i>
GIRM1975	ICEL translation of <i>IGMR1975</i>
GIRM2003	ICEL translation of <i>IGMR2002</i> , incorporating adaptations approved for dioceses of the United States
GNLYC	General Norms for the Liturgical Year and the Calendar, issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 1969
<i>GradRom</i>	<i>Graduale Romanum</i> , prepared by the monks of Solesmes (Tournai: Desclée & Co., 1974)
<i>GradSimp</i>	<i>Graduale Simplex</i> (Vaticana: Libreria Editrice, 1999)
<i>Hadrianum</i>	Jean Deshusses, <i>Le Sacramentaire Grégorien d’après ses principaux manuscrits</i> , 2 ^{me} ed., Spicilegium Friburgense 16 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1979)
ICEL	International Commission on English in the Liturgy
IGLH	<i>Institutio Generalis de Liturgia Horarum</i> , 1971
IGMR1969	<i>Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani</i> , 1969, the first edition associated with <i>OM1969</i>
IGMR1970	<i>Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani</i> , 1970, the second edition associated with <i>MR1970</i>
IGMR1972	<i>Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani</i> , 1972, the third edition issued in light of <i>Ministeria quaedam</i>
IGMR1975	<i>Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani</i> , 1975, the fourth edition associated with <i>MR1975</i>
IGMR2000	<i>Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani</i> , 2000, a preliminary form of the fifth edition
IGMR2002	<i>Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani</i> , 2002, the promulgated form of the fifth edition associated with <i>MR2002</i>

<i>IntOec</i>	<i>Inter Oecumenici</i> , issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 1964
ITTOM Jungmann	Introduction to the Order of Mass, issued by the BCL, 2003 Josef Jungmann, <i>The Mass of the Roman Rite</i> , trans. Francis Brunner, 2 vols. (Westminster: Christian Classics, 1986 [1951 and 1955])
LG	<i>Lumen Gentium</i> , Vatican II “Dogmatic Constitution on the Church,” 1964
<i>LitAuth</i>	<i>Liturgiam Authenticam</i> , issued by CDWDS, 2001
LMT	Liturgical Music Today, issued by the BCL, 1982
MCW	Music in Catholic Worship, issued by the BCL, rev. ed., 1983 (1972)
MQ	<i>Ministeria quaedam</i> , issued <i>motu proprio</i> by Paul VI, 1972
MR1474	<i>Missale Romanum, editio princeps</i> (Milan, 1474)
MR1570	<i>Missale Romanum</i> , promulgated by Pius V, 1570
MR1962	<i>Missale Romanum</i> , promulgated by John XXIII, 1962
MR1970	<i>Missale Romanum, editio typica</i> , promulgated by Paul VI, 1970
MR1975	<i>Missale Romanum, editio typica altera</i> , promulgated by Paul VI, 1975
MR2002	<i>Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia</i> , promulgated by John Paul II, 2002
<i>MusSac</i>	<i>Musicam Sacram</i> , issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 1967
n., nn.	note, notes
no., nos.	number, numbers
OCF	Order of Christian Funerals, issued by the NCCB, 1989
<i>OrdEx</i>	<i>Ordo Exsequiarum</i> 1969
<i>OLM1970-Pr</i>	Introduction (<i>Proemium</i>) of the <i>Ordo Lectionum Missae, editio typica</i> , 1970
<i>OLM1981-Pr</i>	Introduction (<i>Proemium</i>) of the <i>Ordo Lectionum Missae, editio typica altera</i> , 1981
<i>OM1969</i>	<i>Ordo Missae</i> , 1969
OR I	<i>Ordo Romanus Primus</i>
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
PO	<i>Presbyterorum Ordinis</i> , Vatican II “Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests,” 1965
<i>RitCon</i>	<i>Ritus Concelebrationis</i> , promulgated by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 1965
RDCA	Rite of Dedication of a Church and an Altar, 1977
Rites I and II	<i>The Rites of the Catholic Church</i> , 2 vols. (New York: Pueblo, 1990)

Abbreviations and Acronyms

<i>RedSac</i>	<i>Redemptionis Sacramentum</i> , issued by CDWDS, 2004
<i>SC</i>	<i>Sacrosanctum Concilium</i> , Vatican II “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,” 1963
<i>TAA</i>	<i>Tres abhinc annos</i> , issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 1967
<i>TLS</i>	<i>Tra le sollecitudini</i> , issued <i>motu proprio</i> by Pius X, 1903
<i>USCC</i>	United States Catholic Conference (until 1 July 2001)
<i>USCCB</i>	United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (from 1 July 2001)
<i>Veronense</i>	<i>Sacramentarium Veronense</i> , ed. Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, <i>Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Maior, Fontes I</i> (Rome: Herder, 1966)
<i>VarLeg</i>	<i>Varietates Legitimae</i> , issued by CDWDS, 2004

***Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* and the Class of Liturgical Documents to Which It Belongs**

Nathan D. Mitchell and John F. Baldovin

The purpose of this introductory essay is to outline the history of documents that, over two millennia, have sought to ensure the good order or proper celebration of Christian liturgy—especially the Eucharist—in churches of the Latin West. The essay begins with a discussion of liturgical *ordines* and how they developed from the first centuries c.e. through the medieval epoch (part 1). We turn, then, to the drive for liturgical uniformity as it gained momentum in the Latin West (part 2), particularly during the first half of the second millennium, beginning with the “Gregorian Reform” of the eleventh century and concluding with the publication of the *Missale Romanum* of 1570 (*MR1570*). In the final portion of the essay, our attention turns to the evolution of those documents variously called *ritus servandus*, *rubricae generales*, and more recently, “general instructions,” whose purpose is to provide normative, detailed prescriptions for the celebration of the Eucharist in the Roman Rite (part 3).

Liturgical *ordines* and How They Grew: Liturgy as an Object of Correction and Regulation in the First Millennium

Descriptions of Christian ritual and instructions for its proper performance already existed by the middle of the first century c.e. St. Paul, for example, sought to correct and regulate liturgical assemblies at Corinth, where the issues included participants’ grooming and dress (1 Cor 2–16), disorder vs. decorum in the display of charismatic gifts (1 Cor 14:26–40), and deportment at the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor 11:17–34).¹ A generation or two later, the *Didache* or “Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,” a short treatise on Christian faith, life, and practice that belongs to a larger class of documents known as “church orders,” outlines brief ritual patterns for Sunday worship (ch. 14), baptism (ch. 7), and Eucharist (chs.

1. See the discussion by Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” in Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, eds., *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1990), 49:51–64.

9–10). It also offers guidelines for receiving itinerant ministers (e.g., teachers, prophets, apostles) and for choosing residential leaders (e.g., bishops and deacons).²

The *Didache* was more than a book of ceremonies or *rituale*; its first six chapters constitute a short catechism on “the two ways of life” (light vs. darkness) aimed at shaping the Christian convert’s belief and behavior. Church orders were thus “collections of practical directives concerning Christian living; and as these include regulations concerning the method of performing the Church’s rites, and some of the texts of the rites themselves, the Church Orders are liturgical books, codes of canon law, and moral treatises combined.”³ Perhaps the most important example from this class of documents is the well-known Apostolic Tradition (ApTrad), sometimes referred to by the Latin title, *Traditio apostolica*, because it exists in an incomplete Latin manuscript (*Veronense*, LV 53), contained in the Verona Cathedral library. ApTrad is often ascribed to a third-century Roman churchman, Hippolytus (d. ca. 236). Its actual origins, date, transmission, and provenance are still debated by scholars.⁴ Other notable church orders (some of them incorporating material from ApTrad) include the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (ca. 230), the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (ca. 380), the

2. For the Greek text of the *Didache*, see Wily Rordort and Andre Tuilier, eds., *La doctrine des douze apotres (Didachè)*, Sources Chrétiennes 248 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978), 140–98. For a recent translation into English, see Aelred Cody, “The *Didache*: An English Translation,” in Clayton N. Jefford, ed., *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History, and Transmission* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 3–14. On the baptismal rite in *Didache*, see Nathan Mitchell, “Baptism in the *Didache*,” in Jefford, *op. cit.*, 226–55. On the table prayers of *Didache* 9–10 and their relation to Eucharist, see John W. Riggs, “From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements: The Tradition-History of *Didache* 9 and 10,” *Second Century* 4 (1984) 83–101. See also idem, “The Sacred Food of *Didache* 9–10 and Second-Century Ecclesiologies,” in Jefford, *op. cit.*, 256–83. For itinerant and residential ministers in *Didache*, see Jonathan A. Draper, “Social Ambiguity and the Production of Text: Prophets, Teachers, Bishops, and Deacons and the Development of the Jesus Tradition in the Community of the *Didache*,” in Jefford, *op. cit.*, 284–311, and Stephen J. Patterson, “*Didache* 11–13: The Legacy of Radical Itinerancy in Early Christianity,” in Jefford, *op. cit.*, 313–29.

3. Edward J. Yarnold, “Church Orders,” in Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold and Paul Bradshaw, eds., *The Study of Liturgy*, rev. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 89. See further, Maxwell E. Johnson, “The Apostolic Tradition,” and John F. Baldovin, “The Empire Baptized,” in Geoffrey Wainwright and Karen B. Westerfield Tucker, eds., *The Oxford History of Christian Worship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 32–75; 77–130.

4. See Paul F. Bradshaw, Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edward Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition*, Hermeneia Commentary Series (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002). The Eucharistic Prayer found in ApTrad was a remote source for parts of Eucharistic Prayer II in *MR1970*; similarly, ApTrad’s prayer for ordaining a bishop was the principal source for the postconciliar prayer of episcopal ordination in the Roman Rite. See Annibale Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy, 1948–1975*, trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 456; 714–15.

Canons of Hippolytus (336–340), and the *Testamentum Domini* (fifth century?).⁵ As the names indicate, the ritual forms and prayer texts contained in these documents typically claim to have come either from the apostles or directly from the risen Christ himself, who is depicted as dictating detailed liturgical instructions to the church shortly before his ascension. In point of fact, however, few of these documents existed prior to the mid-fourth century. They are not, moreover, “the official manuals of any local church, but rather collections of material deriving from various sources, and perhaps various places and times, and generally showing the idiosyncratic hands of their compilers. They cannot, therefore, be safely used without other corroboration as firm evidence for the actual liturgical practices of any particular Christian group.”⁶

Besides these church orders, we also possess a variety of fourth-century Christian documents that describe liturgical practice and custom in the period after the legalization of Christianity (in 312): prayer books (such as the *Euchologium* or “sacramentary” of Sarapion, bishop of Thmuis [d. after 360]⁷); baptismal catecheses from both Eastern and Western churches (e.g., St. Ambrose’s [d. 397] *De sacramentis* and John Chrysostom’s [d. 407] *Baptismal Instructions*)⁸; and travel diaries (such as that of Egeria, a pilgrim who described liturgies she witnessed in late-fourth-century Jerusalem).¹⁰

Church orders, prayer books, sacramental catecheses, and travel diaries provide important glimpses into local liturgical practice in the first centuries of Christian history. In the three hundred years between the *pax Constantina* and the birth of Islam (in 612), several additional categories of documents important for understanding the ritual shape and content of liturgy in the Latin West emerged.¹¹ The origins of these sources are diverse. Some originated as monastic legislation (e.g., the *Rule of the Master* [ca. 525] and the *Rule of St.*

5. For more on these and later documents, see the entry, “Books, Liturgical,” in Paul F. Bradshaw, ed., *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 66–86. See also Yarnold, “Church Orders,” in *The Study of Liturgy*, 89–91.

6. See “Books, Liturgical,” in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, 67.

7. See John F. Baldovin, “The Empire Baptized,” in *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 77–130.

8. For the liturgical importance of Sarapion’s work, see Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 249 (Rome: Oriental Institute, 1995).

9. See E.C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, 3rd ed., revised and expanded by Maxwell E. Johnson (Collegetown, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2003), especially 176–83 and 40–47, with the text selections and bibliographies given there.

10. For Egeria’s text, see Pierre Maraval, *Journal de Voyage*, rev. ed., with additions and corrections, *Sources Chrétiennes* 296 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997). For an English translation, see John Wilkinson, *Egeria’s Travels*, 3rd ed. (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1999).

11. For a succinct summary of these sources, see Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. by William Storey and Niels Rasmussen (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1986), 10–11; 31–38.

Benedict [ca. 540]¹²); some, as sermons, letters, or commentaries (e.g., the homilies of St. Augustine [d. 430], the letters of St. Leo the Great [d. 461], the scriptural commentaries of St. Gregory the Great [d. 604]); some, as a result of conciliar consensus (whether ecumenical, such as Nicaea [in 325], or local, such as the Spanish councils held in Toledo [e.g., in 400, 589, 633 and 681], Gerona [in 517], and Braga [e.g., in 563, 572, and 675]¹³); others arose from Latin but not “Roman” practice (e.g., the *Expositio brevis antiquae liturgiae gallicanae* of Germanus of Paris [d. 576]); and still others from Roman and/or papal pronouncements (e.g., the letter of Pope Innocent to Decentius in 416, concerning the postbaptismal laying on of hands and chrismation; the letter of the Roman deacon John to Senarius, ca. 500).¹⁴

For anyone interested in the evolving history of the eucharistic *ordo* and its euchology in the Latin West, however, the sacramentaries are the sources that provide the preeminent documentation. Space does not permit a detailed narrative about how the sacramentaries developed, especially during the seventh

12. Both these Latin rules date from the first half of the sixth century, though the *Rule of the Master* is probably earlier (ca. 525) than the *Rule of Benedict* (ca. 540). For a summary discussion of liturgy in the *Rule of the Master*, see Adalbert de Vogüé, “Liturgy,” in Luke Eberle and Charles Philippi, trans., *The Rule of the Master* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1977), 26–42. For liturgical practice in the *Rule of Benedict*, see Nathan D. Mitchell, “The Liturgical Code in the Rule of Benedict,” Appendix 3 in Timothy Fry, ed., *The Rule of St. Benedict in Latin and English* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1981), 379–414.

13. For examples of the liturgical decisions reached by some of these councils (especially as regards Christian initiation), see Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, 153–58.

14. As Cyrille Vogel observed, “the decretals of some of the early popes” should be added to the list of liturgical sources for this historical period, because “some of them are essential to any understanding of liturgical history” (*Medieval Liturgy*, 11). See the chronological list in Eligius Dekkers, *Clavis Patrum Latiorum*, Editio tertia, aucta et emendata, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina (Streenbrugge: Abbatia Sancti Petri, 1995). Section VII, “Romanorum Pontificum Opuscula, Acta, Epistulae Genuinae ac Spuriae,” nos. 1568–1744. It is important to recognize, however, that at this earlier stage of history, a pastoral decision by the bishop of Rome regarding a liturgical practice (e.g., Innocent’s instructions about postbaptismal chrismation in his letter to Bishop Decentius of Gubbio) may well have been required for churches within the pope’s ecclesiastical province, but did not necessarily constitute “universal” legislation obliging conformity from all Latin churches of the West. Thus, for instance, in spite of Innocent’s letter (which appears to prohibit presbyters from performing the second, peculiarly Roman, postbaptismal anointing on the forehead with oil consecrated by the bishop), Gregory the Great allowed that “where bishops are absent, even presbyters ought to anoint the baptized with chrism on their foreheads” (trans. in Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, 206). One is reminded, as well, of the difference between Milan and Rome over the matter of foot-washing as part of the baptismal liturgy. Rome seems never to have had this custom, though Milan did, as Ambrose indicates in Book 3, ch. 5, of his *De sacramentis*: “We are aware that the Roman Church does not follow this custom [of footwashing], although . . . we follow her rite in everything. . . . I wish to follow the Roman Church in everything; but we too are not devoid of common sense. When a better custom is kept elsewhere, we are right to keep it here also” (trans. in Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, 180).

and eighth centuries,¹⁵ but the highlights of that history may be briefly summarized.

1. Most modern scholars agree that the complex liturgical book we call the sacramentary “did not appear at once in its developed form,” but

was preceded and prepared by the *libelli missarum* which were leaflets or small booklets, containing the *formulae* of one or more masses (prayers, preface, introductory formula for the *Hanc igitur* [of the “old Roman canon,” now Eucharistic Prayer I]; they did not include the fixed Canon of the mass (whose history poses special problems all its own) or the readings and chants belonging to the other ministers.¹⁶

The *libelli* were “the link between [the earlier liturgical practice of] ‘structured improvisation’ and the fixed texts of later sacramentaries.”¹⁷ The *Sacramentarium Veronense* (hereafter *Veronense*, also called the Leonine Sacramentary because eighteenth-century scholars thought its contents came principally from Leo the Great) is “a private collection of Roman *libelli*, which before their compilation in this book, were collected and kept in the Lateran archives.”¹⁸ The manuscript of the *Veronense* dates from ca. 600–625. Some scholars view it as less a true sacramentary than a pastiche of texts compiled under private (rather than official) auspices, which was originally a papal book adapted for presbyteral use.¹⁹ Notable, too, is the fact that the *Veronense* often provides multiple formulas for the same liturgical day (e.g., the Ascension). This is a clue that the presiding “celebrant had a wide selection to choose from,” and that this sacramentary was

15. Good introductions, with references and bibliographies, may be found in the following: Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 31–134; Jones, Wainwright, Yarnold, and Bradshaw, *The Study of Liturgy*, 264–85; Cassian Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” in Anscar J. Chupungco, ed., *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, Vol. I: *Introduction to the Liturgy* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 245–54; Eric Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 21–61. See also Eligius Dekkers, ed., *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, 3rd ed. (1995), XII, “Sacramentaria,” nos. 1897–1932.

16. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 37–38. As Vogel noted, one should not confuse these leaflets (*libelli*) containing (some or all of) the presidential prayers at Mass with the *libellus officialis*, a forerunner of the *rituale*, which the Fourth Council of Toledo (633) required every parish priest to possess, or with the *libellus ordinis* (“a ceremonial agenda”), or with the Mozarabic *libellus orationum* (containing prayers said at the Liturgy of the Hours). See *ibid.*, 38. On the *libelli*, see also Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 246–48; Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, 37–42.

17. Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 246. On the history of the important transition from improved prayer to fixed formula, especially in celebrations of the Eucharist, see Allan Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula. The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts*, Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1981), especially 159–215.

18. *Ibid.* The manuscript of the *Veronense* appears to follow the civil calendar, but is incomplete, with the material for January through March (and part of April) missing.

19. Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, 40.

in fact a “liturgical resource book” rather than a canonically required set of texts.²⁰

2. Several types of sacramentaries are to be found in the Latin West.²¹ In addition to the earlier *Veronense*, there are, (a) the old Gelasian Sacramentary, whose manuscript (*Vaticanus reginensis latinus* 316) dates back to ca. 750 c.e. and whose core contents were Roman, as revised on Gallican soil;²² (b) the Gelasian sacramentaries of the eighth century, most of which show the influence of monastic centers in Frankish territory; and (c) the Gregorian sacramentaries, whose most important manuscript (known as the “*Hadrianum*,” sent by Pope Hadrian I [d. 795] to Charlemagne [d. 814]) dates from ca. 811–812. While the old Gelasian Sacramentary appears to have been a presbyteral book, originally intended for use by a parish priest serving a Roman titular church,²³ the *Hadrianum* was a book designed “for the personal use of the pope, or his representatives, organized with a view toward the liturgical celebrations in the station churches of Rome.”²⁴ It had to be adapted and supplemented in order to meet the ordinary needs of parishes in Charlemagne’s kingdom.²⁵

3. In addition to these Roman or Romano-Frankish sacramentaries, other churches of the Latin West (in Italy, Gaul, Germany, Spain, and the British Isles) developed their own distinctive, non-Roman sacramentaries.²⁶

4. The persistence of non-Roman, Latin liturgies in the West, as well as the coexistence of numerous forms of the sacramentary in eighth and ninth century Europe, reveal that during the first millennium what we now call “the Roman liturgy” had not yet gelled into a uniform, universally accepted, standard and official form. Textual variation remained the rule, even though an identifiable *ordo* (ritual shape and sequence) for the Roman eucharistic liturgy had certainly emerged.²⁷ Still, it is also clear that, even within Rome itself, two liturgical tradi-

20. Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 246. For the *Veronense*’s texts for Ascension Day, see Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, ed., *Sacramentarium Veronense*, *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta*, series major, Fontes, I (Rome: Herder, 1956), nos. 169–186. One of these formulas (no. 186) eventually made its way into the *Missale Romanum*, as reformed after the Council of Trent and published in 1570.

21. For details, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 61–134.

22. See Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, 212.

23. Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, 45.

24. Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 251.

25. When the *Hadrianum* arrived in Aachen, the Carolingian liturgists were dismayed to find that its Latin needed correcting, and that it seemed “incomplete” and in need of a supplement to meet the needs of parishes in that part of Europe. See Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 253.

26. For details, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 107–110. See also Gabriel Ramis, “Liturgical Books of the Non-Roman West,” in Anscar J. Chupungco, ed., *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, Vol. I: *Introduction to the Liturgy* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 315–327.

27. As Eric Palazzo observes, “It is in the Carolingian and particularly the Ottonian periods that the *Ordo Missae* developed in an important way; it contains all the prayers said by the

tions were developing side-by-side, one papal/episcopal (represented by the *Hadrianum*), the other presbyteral (represented, e.g., by the old Gelasian Sacramentary).²⁸

5. Over the course of the first millennium, then, the eucharistic liturgy of the Roman Rite became a cultural and euchological hybrid. As Cyrille Vogel summarized:

the Roman liturgy assimilated many older liturgical usages native to Gaul . . . and ended by producing a type of hybrid or mixed liturgy which may be termed Romano-Frankish. This is the liturgy we find preserved in the earliest surviving liturgical MSS, all of which were redacted in Frankish Gaul. This is also the liturgy which was explained and commented upon by such prominent figures as Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), Amalarius of Metz (d. 850/851) and Rabanus Maurus (d. 856) and which was definitively regulated—as regards the Eucharist—by St. Benedict of Aniane (d. 821) in the corrected *Hadrianum* and its famous *Supplement* . . .

In a second stage of its evolution, this mixed liturgy spread with surprising but understandable speed to all the churches of Northern Europe and, after the *Renovatio imperii* (962), established itself without difficulty at Rome under the patronage of the Ottonian emperors.²⁹

As we will see in part 3 of this introduction, such an evolution continued during the second millennium, particularly in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It was then, with the rise of the mendicant orders, that the Romano-Frankish liturgy—especially as it was celebrated at the papal court—became the Romano-Frankish-Franciscan liturgy. The entire process that shaped the liturgical usage we now call the Roman Rite

was one of osmosis, amalgamation, and hybridization; liturgies were never simply substituted for one another; they influenced and modified one another, and even the dominant Roman liturgy issued from the process changed and enhanced. As Theodor Klauser says so well: *Romana est sed etiam nostra*. “The Liturgy which is performed by us today, is therefore, truly Roman, but it is at the same time also our own.”³⁰

priest during Mass, in general before the Eucharistic Prayer;” still there were significant variables, and “the study of the *Ordo Missae* often uncovers the liturgical geography proper to a specific sacramentary, demonstrating liturgical exchanges between important monasteries [where most manuscripts were copied], as happened in the course of the ninth and tenth centuries.” *A History of Liturgical Books*, 24.

28. Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 249.

29. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 2.

30. *Ibid.*, 3. Vogel is citing Klauser’s *A Short History of the Western Liturgy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 84.

6. Most of the sources mentioned thus far, particularly the sacramentaries, provided presider's prayers for the celebration of the Eucharist and often included a text for the Eucharistic Prayer (the Roman Canon). Yet these documents provided little by way of rubrics, descriptions, or directives for the proper performance of the rites. Thus, for instance, within a series of presidential prayers "*per dominicis diebus [sic]*," the old Gelasian Sacramentary (*Vaticanus reginensis latinus* 316) provides a text of the Roman Canon, but accompanies it with very few ritual details.³¹ Twice, the word "*respondetur*" is placed before the people's responses in the preface dialogue,³² and there are crosses (probably indicating the place where the presider should sign the elements, prior to the consecration).³³ In the same document, after the Lord's Prayer and its embolism, a rubric directs: "*Post haec communicat sacerdos cum ordinibus sacris cum omni populo.*"³⁴ But again, precisely *how* this communion rite is to be conducted is left to the reader's imagination.

7. The reason why rubrical directives are omitted is fairly simple. The sacramentary was not intended to be a *rituale*. "How-to" procedures were, for the most part, confined to three other categories of Western liturgical books, viz., the *ordines*, the ordinals and the ceremonials. "Strictly speaking," writes Cyrille Vogel, "an *ordo* is a description of a liturgical action (*actio liturgica*), a directory or guide for the celebrant and his ministers setting forth in detail the arrangement of the entire ritual procedure and how to carry it out."³⁵

The *Ordines Romani*, fifty of which were edited by Michel Andrieu between 1931 and 1961, began to appear in the middle of the seventh century.³⁶ Like the sacramentaries, these *ordines* are hybrids; thus, like the sacramentaries, "the oldest collections of *ordines*, even those of purely Roman origin are all of Frankish or Germanic composition."³⁷ As liturgical documents, the *ordines* "permit us to witness a liturgy as it was actually celebrated" at the time when the work was drawn up.³⁸ Thus, for example, *Ordo Romanus I* (*OR I*, first analyzed in the late seventeenth century by the Benedictine scholar, Jean Mabillon [d. 1707]) provides "the first full description of Eucharistic worship at Rome" and contains

31. L. Cunibert Mohlberg, ed., *Liber sacramentorum Romanae aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, *Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta*, Series maior, Fontes, IV (Rome: Herder, 1960), nos. 1242–1255.

32. *Ibid.*, no. 1242.

33. *Ibid.*, no. 1244.

34. *Ibid.*, no. 1260.

35. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 135. The use of the word "ordo" for a description of a liturgical rite appears to have become common "sometime after Gregory the Great (d. 604), i.e., after the period of liturgical improvisation was over. It does not seem to have been much used before the VIII century." *Ibid.*

36. Michel Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani du haut moyen âge*, 5 vols., *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense* 11, 23, 24, 28, 29 (Louvain, 1960).

37. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 145.

38. *Ibid.*

not only our oldest ritual description of a solemn papal Mass, but details about the “major structures of the Roman Church and its internal organization: the seven ecclesiastical precincts of the City, the *tituli*, the deaconries, the *episcopium* or *partriarchium Laternanense*, the stational liturgies, the precedence among the various dignitaries and a description of the papal cavalcade.”³⁹ Here, for example, is a portion of *OR I*’s very detailed description of the ritual for the preparation of the gifts:

Then as the deacon goes to the altar, an acolyte comes with a chalice and a corporal over (it), raises the chalice in his left hand and hands the corporal to the deacon. He takes it off the chalice and lays it on the right side of the altar, throwing the other end to the second deacon so that they can spread it out . . .

The pope, after saying *Let us pray*, goes down at once to the senatorial area, the chancellor holding his right hand and the chief counselor his left, and receives the offerings of the princes in the order of their authorities. After him the archdeacon receives the flasks and pours them into a larger chalice held by the district subdeacon. He is followed by an acolyte with a bowl outside his cope into which the chalice is poured out when it is full. The district subdeacon receives the offerings from the pope and hands them to the subdeacon in attendance, and he puts them in a linen cloth held by two acolytes. After the pope, a hebdomadary bishop receives the rest of the offerings, so that he may put them with his own hand in the linen cloth which follows him. After him the deacon who follows the archdeacon receives (the flasks) and pours them into the bowl with his own hand.⁴⁰

Similarly, *OR XI* provides us with a Roman directory for celebrating the liturgies of Christian initiation, including rites for the Lenten scrutinies and a full baptismal ceremony celebrated during the Easter Vigil.⁴¹

The *Ordines Romani* are clearly one of the principal forebears of the *IGMR*, but two other categories of “how-to” books aimed at the “good ordering of the liturgy” are also worth mentioning, viz., the ordinals and ceremonials. While *ordines* tend to confine their content to a description of one particular liturgical rite (e.g., Christian initiation, a papal Mass), ordinals typically describe “the entire course of the liturgical year, with the intention of establishing a certain uniform usage,” but “because the ordinal is concerned with local and not universal custom, there

39. *Ibid.*, 155.

40. The English translation is taken from R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist Early and Reformed*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 125–26. In the Latin edition of Andrieu (*Les Ordines romani du haut moyen âge*), the text of *OR I* is found in Vol. 2 (1948), 74–108.

41. *Ibid.*, 164–66. See also Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, 244–51. Since our knowledge of *OR XI* comes from ninth century manuscripts that were produced in France, it is not completely clear how much of this baptismal liturgy represents Roman (rather than Frankish) practice.

is no standard collection of texts comparable to Andrieu's edition of the *Ordines*.⁴² For example, monastic ordinals—such as the *Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc* or the *Ordinary of the Royal Abbey of St.-Denis*—usually provided descriptions for both the Hours and Mass, plus other rites specific to the communities for which they were written.⁴³ But especially notable, “because of its influence on the Roman rite,” was the ordinal composed by the Franciscan Haymo of Faversham (d. 1244) in 1243–44; “Haymo wrote both an *Ordo breviarum* and an *Ordo missalis*; when both were issued together the document was called *Ordinarium secundum consuetudinem Romanae curiae*.”⁴⁴ Haymo's work thus contributed enormously to the consolidation of the medieval Roman Rite (the papal liturgy of the Roman Curia) and to the creation of a ritual pattern that would shape the development of the modern Roman Rite.⁴⁵

Finally, ceremonials were books that described “with greater precision than the ordinal,” the ritual customs and practices of a community “throughout the liturgical year.”⁴⁶ Though the roots of the ceremonial are medieval, it became far more conspicuous as a book aimed at the “good ordering of the liturgy” during the early Renaissance, when two important papal ceremonials were produced: the *Caeremoniale Romanum* of Peter Burgos, who served Nicholas V (d. 1455) as papal Master of Ceremonies (1447–1455), and the *De caeremoniis Curiae Romanae libri tres* (1485) of Agostino Patrizi Piccolomini and John Burckard (sometimes spelled Burckhard, d. 1506).⁴⁷ It was Burckard's treatise on the *Ordo Missae* that served as one of the chief sources for the eucharistic rite found in the *Missale Romanum* of 1570 (the so-called “Pian” or “Tridentine” missal, hereafter *MR1570*).⁴⁸

Neither the sacramentaries (with their presidential prayer texts) nor the *ordines*, ordinals, and ceremonials (with their rubrics and ritual descriptions) claimed to establish a definitive *Ordo Missae* that was obligatory for all churches of the Roman Rite in the Latin West. Nor did these documents attempt to provide a pastoral-theological commentary on the rites. Their purpose was descrip-

42. Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 292–93.

43. See *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*, rev. ed., by Christopher N. L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002); Edward B. Foley, *The First Ordinary of the Royal Abbey of St.-Denis in France: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 526*, *Spicilegium Friburgense*, 32 (Fribourg: University Press, 1990).

44. Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 294.

45. See Stephen J. P. van Dijk, *The Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, *Studia et Documenta Franciscana*, 1–2 (Leiden: Brill, 1963), Vol. 1, 1–109; 156–206; Vol. 2, 1–331 (along with the introduction).

46. Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 295. Folsom suggests that the ceremonials originated during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when the need arose, especially within the Roman curia, for “writing down the rubrics for the complicated ceremonies and court etiquette of papal functions.”

47. *Ibid.*, 296.

48. For the text of Burckard's *Ordo*, see J. Wickham Legg, ed., *Tracts on the Mass*, Henry Bradshaw Society, Vol. 27 (London: Harrison and Sons, 1904), 120–78.

tive rather than prescriptive; exemplary rather than obligatory. It was understood, for instance, that a papal rite such as the one outlined in *OR I* would need to be tweaked and adjusted, perhaps quite significantly, if Mass were being celebrated by another bishop or by a presbyter serving a parish. But it is also clear that, during the second millennium, ritual *ordines* once considered authoritative “models” or *exempla* gradually came to be seen as juridically obligatory and canonical. Thus, before proceeding in Part III to a discussion of the immediate predecessors of *IGMR*, some remarks must be made about how and why this fateful shift from authoritative *exemplum* to obligatory *ordo* occurred.

The Drive Toward Liturgical Uniformity in the Latin West

In the second part of this essay we seek to show how the ideal of a single, invariable, uniform Roman Rite, obligatory for virtually all churches in the Latin West, arose.

For most of the first millennium, the person responsible for overseeing ritual matters in a local church was the chief liturgist of the diocese, the bishop. Even the Roman bishop was reluctant to impose liturgical uniformity, preferring instead to respect the distinctive ritual practices of diverse peoples and cultures, as we learn from Bede’s (d. 735) report of Gregory the Great’s responses to Augustine of Canterbury (d. ca. 605).⁴⁹ Scholars have long assumed that these arrangements began to change after the election in 1073 of the reform-minded pope, Gregory VII (d. 1085), for it is at this point in history that we seem to encounter the first systematic papal program to establish a uniform liturgical “rite” for all Christians of the Latin West.⁵⁰ Indeed, in *Quod a nobis* (9 July 1568), his introductory decree to the Roman breviary as reformed after the Council of Trent (1545–63), Pope Pius V (d. 1572) cited Gregory VII as responsible for restoring the “*divini officii formula*” originally “established, wisely, by the supreme pontiffs Gelasius I and Gregory I.”⁵¹ The implication is that Gregory VII

49. See Bede, *A History of the English Church and People*, Book 1, ch. 27.

50. In view of his later emphasis on legal precedent, Gregory’s own election to the papacy was, ironically, irregular, for it failed to meet the conditions that had been drawn up under Nicholas II in 1059. See Colin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 109.

51. “*Quae divini officii formula pie olim ac sapienter a summis pontificibus, praesertim Gelasio ac Gregorio primis constituta, a Gregorio autem septimo reformata.*” For text, see Reinhard Elze, “Gregor VII. und die Römische Liturgie,” *Studi Gregoriani*, XIII (1989): 179, n. 3. Elze notes (*ibid.*, 180) that Gregory VII’s reputation as a liturgical reformer may owe a great deal to the work of Bernold of Constance, whose liturgical treatise, *Micrologus de ecclesiasticis observationibus*, was described by its modern editor, V. L. Kennedy, as “probably the best of the many medieval commentaries on the liturgy.” See V. L. Kennedy, “For a new edition of the *Micrologus* of Bernold of Constance,” in *Mélanges en l’honneur de Mgr. M. Andrieu*, *Revue de sciences religieuses*, volume hors série (Strasbourg: University Press, 1956), 229–41; here, 229. Elze seems to be unaware that Kennedy died (in 1974) before this edition of the *Micrologus* could be

had devised a single ritual schema for the Hours by restoring an ancient and uniform Roman Rite for use throughout the Latin West.⁵²

But is the portrait of Gregory VII as a liturgical reformer reliable? Our historical outline in part 1 shows how diverse and hybridized the eleventh century liturgies Gregory knew actually were.⁵³ In the first century of the second millennium, the Roman liturgy was in fact a multicultural amalgam of diverse usages, many from north of the Alps, imported into the city of Rome by the Ottonian emperors during the mid- to late-tenth century.⁵⁴ It is probably true that “for Gregory the usage of the Roman church was to be the standard for universal imitation following a liturgical conservatism that sought to exclude what was not ancient and to promote what was believed to be the usage of Pope Gregory the Great.” At the same time it seems “Gregory was content to leave the worship of the Roman churches little disturbed, while he enunciated traditional principles that may have been congenial to many clergy and laity.”⁵⁵ So while Gregory may well have wished to purge the late-eleventh-century liturgy in Rome of “accretions of foreign . . . especially German, traditions,” his approach to the task appears to have been gradual and “piecemeal.”⁵⁶ Moreover, because the pope’s pastoral responsibilities included “an ancient round of worship which was by no means confined to the Lateran but which included the other great basilicas and the station churches of Rome,” Gregory would have found it necessary to accommodate himself to “a complex of rites and customs . . . cherished and guarded” in Rome’s numerous urban and suburban

completed. See Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 28, n. 22. On the limitations of Bernold’s understanding of what he may have experienced in Rome, see Stephen van Dijk and Joan Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy* (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1960), 49–50, 74, 248–49.

52. For more on Gregory VII’s “reform” of the “Roman” office, see Elze, “Gregor VII. und die Römische Liturgie,” 181–82.

53. See H. E. J. Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII (1073–85) and the Liturgy,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 55, no. 1 (April 2004): 55–83. Cowdrey observes that in Gregory’s time, “at Rome itself no less than elsewhere in Latin Christendom, there was a wide and consciously sustained difference of observances amongst different churches of the city” (*ibid.*, 56). Cowdrey goes on to quote a letter written in 1131 by Peter Abelard (d. 1142) to Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) in which the writer remarked that “not even the very City [of Rome] holds to the ancient custom of the Roman see, but only the Lateran church, which is the mother of all, holds to the ancient office; none of its daughters follows it in this respect—not even the very basilica of the Roman palace” (cited in *ibid.*, 57). Cowdrey notes that Abelard’s comments “would also have applied in the previous century” (*ibid.*, 56). “The separation of the papal household and the Lateran basilica gave rise to a gathering duality of observance which, in the thirteenth century, under Franciscan influence, led to the liturgy of the papal court’s becoming the general standard for the Western Church” (*ibid.*, 57).

54. The Mainz Pontifical (the so-called “Romano-Germanic Pontifical,” ca. 950) was established at Rome under Otto I in the mid-tenth century. Despite its provenance, this book came to be regarded as an *Ordo Romanus*. See Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 238–39.

55. H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1070–1085* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 320.

56. *Ibid.*

churches. To this must be added the fact that the sixty or so “central Italian bishoprics . . . directly subject to the bishop of Rome as head of what is sometimes called . . . the Roman church province,” also had their own distinct liturgical “traditions and loyalties” which “it would be unwise lightly to offend.”⁵⁷ Any initiatives toward ritual reform or restoration which Gregory VII might have launched had to take into account a city and an ecclesiastical province where liturgical diversity was the norm rather than the exception.

Historian H. E. J. Cowdrey has thus concluded that the “parameters within which liturgical changes might be introduced in late eleventh-century Rome” were rather narrow.⁵⁸ It is true that Bernold (Bernhold) of Constance (d. 1100), who attended a Lenten synod in Rome in 1079, wrote his treatise *Micrologus de ecclesiasticis observationibus* to help “propagate Roman customs and observances in all matters of liturgy,” especially the *Ordo Missae*, and that he portrays Gregory VII as a restorer of the ancient Roman customs.⁵⁹ Yet Bernold himself was “well aware of the extent and tenacity of other conventions at Rome and elsewhere,” and he seems to have had “some appreciation of the reasons for them.”⁶⁰

While a careful examination of sources reveals that Gregory VII did promote (or permit) liturgical changes in several areas—e.g., the structure and content of the Liturgy of the Hours, the principal liturgical seasons (e.g., Lent, Eastertide, Pentecost), the commemoration of saints, the offerings to be made by all participants at Mass—his instincts were deeply conservative.⁶¹ There is good reason to believe that Gregory saw himself as a liturgical reformer or restorer strictly in terms of the profession that popes of his time made prior to entering office. In words addressed to St. Peter, each of them promised “to diminish or to change nothing of what I have found to be handed down and preserved by my most approved predecessors and to admit no novelty; but fervently as their true disciple and follower with every endeavour of my mind to conserve and venerate whatever I find to be canonically handed down.”⁶² Given his commitment to these ideals, it is easy to understand why Gregory VII’s contemporaries looked, increasingly, “to the apostolic see in liturgical matters in order to establish both the authentic legacy of the ancient past and, in the light of it, the best practice of the present.”⁶³

The central concern of Gregory VII’s “liturgical reform” was thus to preserve and safeguard what he regarded as the ancient patrimony of his papal

57. Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII and the Liturgy,” 58.

58. *Ibid.*, 61. See also n. 50 above.

59. Elze, “Gregor VII. und die Römische Liturgie,” 180–81.

60. Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII and the Liturgy,” 62.

61. For an excellent summary of the sources and subjects of Gregory’s liturgical work, see Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII and the Liturgy,” 61–78.

62. For the formula of this papal profession, see Hans Foerster, ed., *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum* (Berne: Francke, 1958), 429–31.

63. Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII and the Liturgy,” 74–75.

predecessors “by pruning away the results of latter-day and extraneous intervention by foreign rulers and influences.”⁶⁴ Within the city of Rome, as we have seen, Gregory used caution in introducing change; outside the city and its ecclesiastical province, Gregory seems to have been a more vigorous advocate of conformity to Roman usage. “Within Latin Christendom, wherever Gregory regarded a regional liturgy as seriously deviant from Roman usage in character and language . . . he was liable to proceed against it with resolution and vigour.”⁶⁵ While there is no clear evidence that Gregory sought to repress other ancient liturgies in Italy (e.g., those of Milan and Benevento), such is not the case when we turn to Spain and the Mozarabic rite.

Early in his papacy, Gregory VII began seeking ways to integrate Spain more fully into the rest of medieval Europe. This was done, in part, through the suppression of the liturgical rival of the ancient, indigenous liturgy of the Spanish churches, especially that of Toledo (which the pope called “*superstitio toletana*”).⁶⁶ Gregory’s initiative met stiff resistance. Especially controversial was his claim, in a letter of 28 June 1077, that “the kingdom of Spain belongs to St. Peter and the Holy Roman Church, as handed down in ancient grants.”⁶⁷ This would have meant that Spanish kings were papal vassals, required to pay annual tribute. King Alphonso VI of León-Castile (d. 1109) did capitulate to Gregory’s will in the matter of liturgy, but even after the Mozarabic rite was “suppressed,” it persisted.⁶⁸

64. *Ibid.*, 71.

65. *Ibid.*, 78. In contrast, Gregory’s dealings with the Greek church of Constantinople, as well as with the Armenians, was largely irenic and accommodating. He “nowhere suggested that the Greek liturgy was radically objectionable, let alone that it was heretical and should therefore be abandoned,” although he did accuse the Greeks of presumption (*temeritas*) because they had objected to the Armenians’ use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist (*ibid.*, 80).

66. See Joseph F. O’Callaghan, “The Integration of Christian Spain into Europe: The Role of Alfonso VI of León-Castile,” in Bernard F. Reilly, *Santiago, Saint-Denis, and Saint Peter: The Reception of the Roman Liturgy in León-Castile in 1080* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1985), 101–20. See also, in the same volume, Ramón González, “The Persistence of the Mozarabic Liturgy in Toledo after A.D. 1080,” 157–85. (See González, 163, for the phrase “*superstitio toletana*.”) It should be remembered that at this time Spain was not yet a single, unified nation, but rather a collection of separate kingdoms. Catalonia and Aragón, as O’Callaghan notes, had already adopted the Roman liturgy prior to the election of Gregory VII in 1073. León-Castile held out longer against Roman pressure to conform. It should be pointed out that Gregory made similar moves against his “Slavonic competitors” by categorically refusing the petition of Duke Wratislav II of Bohemia to “permit performance of divine service . . . in the Slav tongue,” arguing that God had left parts of the Bible obscure lest, “if it were clear to all,” it might be misunderstood and so lead the simple astray. See Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII and the Liturgy,” 79.

67. A partial English translation of Gregory’s “pastoral letter to the rulers of Spain” may be found in Ephraim Emerton, trans. and ed., *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII* (New York: Norton, 1969), 123–125. The quotation is from Emerton’s translation. Emerton provides the appropriate reference to Gregory’s Latin letters in the *Registrum* on p. 123. The sources on which Gregory’s claims to legal authority over Spain were based are in fact largely spurious.

68. See O’Callaghan, “The Integration of Christian Spain,” 107.

What was novel about Gregory VII's approach to the liturgy in Spain (and in Slavic territories) was his attempt to extend Roman (i.e., papal) authority over worship in local churches outside the ecclesiastical province of Rome by transforming questions of liturgical custom or practice into matters of legal precedent (based on his argument that the kingdom of Spain belonged to the patrimony of Peter).⁶⁹ Although much of the Iberian peninsula had been under Islamic control for centuries, Gregory argued that it was now high time to restore the "tribute [*servitium*] formerly paid to St. Peter [but] so long . . . withheld from us on account of their [i.e., the Islamic rulers'] lack of faith and their tyranny."⁷⁰

There can be little doubt that the Gregorian reform of worship in the Latin West cast a long shadow. Two crucial consequences for liturgy flowed from that reform:

1. First, Gregory VII's effort to suppress the Mozarabic rite helped redefine the complex relations between doxology, doctrine, liturgy, and law. The Gregorian reform began to reinterpret the liturgical *Ordo Romanus* as obligatory legal precedent. Increasingly, liturgical liceity and doctrinal orthodoxy meant conformity, at least in the Latin West, with the liturgical customs of neither the Roman *tituli* nor the "mother church" (St. John Lateran), but of the papal household, whose liturgy was in fact a multicultural amalgam codified largely in transalpine books such as the *Romano-Germanic Pontifical*, brought to Rome under imperial, rather than papal, auspices.

69. Ramón González ("The Persistence of the Mozarabic Liturgy," 159–63) argues that the Gregorian Reform was based on three legal and dogmatic principles. The first of these was "the proprietary right of the Holy See over the 'realm' of Spain" (159); the second was the pope's insistence that any deviation from the "Roman Rite" meant deviation from "right (i.e., correct) doctrine" (160–61); the third flowed from Gregory's conviction that no local church has autonomy in matters liturgical, and hence that a difference in *rite* is tantamount to *schism* (161–62). A local Latin church with its own "rite" would become, in a quasi-legal manner, a schismatic church. Yet curiously, Gregory seems not have applied these same principles to the indigenous rites of Milan or Benevento.

70. Gregory VII, "Pastoral Letter to the Rulers of Spain," in Emerton, *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII*, 124. History reveals that the deeds and charters Gregory used to support his claim of sovereignty over Spain are largely spurious. The use of such forgeries to support papal claims prompted Cardinal Yves Congar, the Dominican ecclesiologist and peritus at the Second Vatican Council, to conclude that the eleventh century was "the great turning point in ecclesiology." For by seeking to eradicate simony, nepotism, clerical concubinage, lay investiture, and a host of other pastoral problems through an appeal to legal precedent, Gregory VII wound up, in Congar's words, "making the Church itself into a legal institution" rather than a spiritual *communio*. See Bernard Lauret, ed., *Fifty Years of Catholic Theology: Conversations with Yves Congar* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 40 and 42. Gregory's action, Congar claimed, led the church "to adopt very much the same attitudes as the temporal power itself, to conceive of itself as a society, as a power, when in reality it is a communion, with ministers, servants" (ibid., 42). Paradoxically (and probably unintentionally), the Gregorian reform thus resulted in a massive secularization of the Petrine ministry and the ecclesiology of *communio* that was intended to support it.

2. Second, the Gregorian reform held that the “Roman Rite” creates a legal and doctrinal *norma non normata* from which there can be neither variance nor appeal, and hence, any deviation from the Roman liturgy constitutes a virtual deviation from dogma (and so is tantamount to heresy). To employ any other rite in the liturgy is to risk heterodoxy—or, at the very least, schismatic idiosyncrasy. A local church choosing to follow its own native rite would in effect be choosing schism. Yet, as we have seen, Gregory VII himself seems to have regarded the Milanese rite, for example, as unobjectionable, and Gregory’s own predecessors had approved the Mozarabic rite.⁷¹

The results of the Gregorian reform were thus ambivalent. In dealing with Milan and Benevento, Gregory VII appeared to reaffirm the ancient tradition of local liturgical autonomy and regional variation in the Latin West; in dealing with Spain (and the Slavs), he seemed to claim a legal basis (*in jus et proprietatem*)⁷² for insisting on adherence to the *Ordo Romanus* and for denying liturgical autonomy or variation.

More important, however, was the way the Gregorian liturgical reform was later interpreted in the West. “Since the later sixteenth century the prevailing view has been that the pontificate of Gregory VII represents a new departure in the liturgical history of the Western Church.”⁷³ Intentionally or not, Gregory’s claims against Spain put into play a principle which held that the Roman Rite enjoys preemptive legal status that undercuts the liceity and legitimacy of any other liturgy in the Latin West. That is why, as noted above, Pope Pius V could preface his publication of the reformed Roman Breviary of 1568 with the claim that Gregory VII was the great “restorer” of Roman liturgical order. Gregory’s actions “implied a rejection of unwarranted imperial and royal intervention in spiritual matters and a vindication of papal authority according to the model of the ancient church as Gregory conceived it”; they also “announced the end of ‘Franco-German’ leadership and the unification of the Christian order under papal headship.”⁷⁴ As a result of the Gregorian reform, exclusive papal authority over liturgy in the Latin West had been boldly asserted as a matter of law,

71. González, “The Persistence of the Mozarabic Liturgy,” 163. In 1080, the Spanish Council of Burgos capitulated to papal pressure and made the “Roman Rite” the official liturgy for all of Spain. As González (164–65) notes, the decisions of Burgos may have made a difference to the *northern* Spanish kingdoms, but probably had little impact on “the other half of Spain, in which the Mozarabs constituted a sizable Christian minority” and where “the mandate of Rome and the decree of Burgos were simply ignored. The Mozarab communities simply continued in the peaceful possession of their particular liturgy . . . Moreover, none of the kings and bishops of the northern peninsula, to whom Rome had peremptorily directed a change of ritual, made the least gesture of instituting liturgical reform beyond the area in which they exercised jurisdiction.” Since the Second Vatican Council, a modern version of the ancient Mozarabic liturgy has been prepared and approved. See *Missale hispano-mozarabicum*, 2 vols. (Barcelona: Conferencia Episcopal Espanola, 1991–1994).

72. See Cowdrey, “Pope Gregory VII and the Liturgy,” 78 (and n. 83).

73. *Ibid.*, 81.

74. *Ibid.*, 83.

if not everywhere established as a matter of fact. In principle, at least, the Roman church's legal right to insist on liturgical uniformity—even outside its ecclesiastical province—had been set in motion.

The Evolution of IGMR

Remote Ancestors of IGMR

To assert a legal right is one thing; to implement it, quite another. Despite the increasing influence of the “Roman liturgy” (the *ordo* of the papal court as reorganized in the mid-thirteenth century⁷⁵), diversity and local variation (in matters of calendar, liturgical custom, and ritual detail) continued to characterize public worship in Latin churches of the medieval West. Even within a relatively small country such as England, multiple usages abounded, as Thomas Cranmer (d. 1556) famously complained in the preface to the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*: “Heretofore, there hath been great diuersitie in saying and synging in churches within this realm: some folowyng Salsbury use, some Herford use, some the use of Bangor, some of Yorke, and some of Lincolne: now from he[n]cefurth, all the whole realme shall haue but one use.”⁷⁶ The quote reveals that in the mid-sixteenth century a Reformer (like Cranmer) and a pope (like Pius V) could, for perhaps very different reasons, subscribe to a common goal of liturgical uniformity.⁷⁷

The technology of printing made achievement of this goal feasible. As our discussion in part 1 shows, the sacramentaries (containing the presider's prayers at Mass) were of several different types; moreover, they circulated as manuscripts and hence were open to tampering, revision, and scribal error. Much the same situation obtained in the era when “missals” (containing not only the presider's prayers, but also the readings and chants assigned to the eucharistic liturgy for each day) began to replace the sacramentary as the “presider's

75. It is important to note that even in the latter part of the thirteenth century the “Roman liturgy” was not yet one single, uniform rite. By 1275, “the city of Rome knew four liturgical customs: the papal court, St. Peter's in the Vatican, the reform of Cardinal Orsini (later Pope Nicholas III), and the Lateran Basilica.” Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 265. The liturgy of the papal court—including its “missal”—was revised and reorganized under the direction of the Franciscan minister general, Haymo of Faversham, in 1243–44. See *ibid.*, 266.

76. *The First and Second Prayer Books of King Edward VI*, Everyman's Library no. 448 (New York: Dutton, 1910), 4.

77. In the same preface, Cranmer appeals to the ancient notion of episcopal authority over the liturgy: “And forsomuche as nothyng can, almoste, be so plainly set furth, but doutes maie rise in the use and practysing of the same: to appease all suche diuersitie (if any arise), and for the resolucion of all doubttes, concerningy the maner how to understande, do, and execute the thynges conteygned in this booke: the parties that so doubt, or diuersely take any thyng, shall always resorte to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discrecion shall take order for the quietyng and appeasyng of the same: so that the same ordre be not contrary to any thng conteygned in this boke.” *Ibid.*, 5.

book.”⁷⁸ In 1474, the first printed version (*editio princeps*) of the *Missale Romanum* (MR1474) appeared at Milan.⁷⁹ Predictably, it contains an “*ordinarium Misse [sic]*” that begins with the “prayers at (the foot of) the altar” (“*Introibo ad altare dei,*” etc.) and concludes with the prayer “*Placeat tibi sancta trinitas,*” to be said after the presider has given the (final) blessing at the end of Mass.⁸⁰ In between are most of the texts and prayers for the *Ordo Missae* which anyone familiar with the later MR1570 will find familiar, though some elements (e.g., the *Kyrie*) are missing. Prayers for the “offertory” (now replaced by the *praeparatio donorum*, “preparation of the gifts”) are provided (e.g., “*Suscipe, sancte pater,*” which accompanies the priest’s offering of the host; and “*Deus, qui humane substantie,*” which accompanies the act of mixing water into the wine, etc.). Also included is a text of the old Roman canon (the basis of today’s Eucharistic Prayer I), with variable prefaces and, where applicable, proper *communicantes* (EP I: “In union with the whole church”) and *hanc igitur* (EP I: “Father, accept this offering”).⁸¹ The Lord’s Prayer and its embolism follow the doxology of the Eucharistic Prayer, and the *Agnus Dei* accompanies the fraction rite.⁸²

Yet the printed MR1474 provides few “how to” details or rubrics for the eucharistic liturgy. It contains neither a *ritus servandus* (included, a century later, as part of the “front matter” in MR1570), nor interpretive pastoral or catechetical notes on the *Ordo Missae*, in the manner, for instance, of the late-medieval *Lay Folk’s Mass Book*.⁸³ This is somewhat surprising, since earlier medieval *ordines*—including Haymo of Faversham’s mid-thirteenth-century *Indutus planeta* (an *Ordo Missae* that draws heavily upon the papal liturgies, though it was composed for the ordained Franciscans) contain a generous amount of ritual

78. As Cyrille Vogel (*Medieval Liturgy*, 105) remarks, “Even by the end of the IX century, the *Liber sacramentorum* was giving way before the *Missalis plenarius*, a new kind of volume made up of four previous types of liturgical books: sacramentary, epistolary, evangelary and antiphonary. By the second half of the IX century, the plenary missals were already beginning to be more numerous than the sacramentaries. In the first half of the XII century, the sacramentaries were a small minority, in the XIII they were exceptional and in the XIV, they were archaic leftovers.” For a succinct summary of how the missal evolved as the principal book connected with celebration of the Roman Eucharist, see Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, 107–110. See also Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” 262–67.

79. See Robert Lippe, ed., *Missale Romanum Mediolani, 1474*, 2 vols., Henry Bradshaw Society, vols. 17 and 33 (London: Harrison and Sons, 1899). The text of the *Missale* is in Vol. 1 (HBS vol. 17). In the quotations from this printed missal, I follow the conventions of the text, even when this departs from more traditional Latin spellings. Note that in the second volume of this work (HBS 33), Lippe collates the text of MR1474 with other printed editions of the *Missale Romanum* that appeared prior to the Pian Missal of 1570 (MR1570).

80. *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, 198–211.

81. *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, 200–201 (“offertory prayers”), 202–209 (Eucharistic Prayer, with proper prefaces and variables).

82. *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, 209.

83. See Thomas F. Simmons, ed., *The Lay Folks Mass Book*, Early English Text Society, no. 71 (London: Oxford University Press, 1879; reprinted, 1968), 2–60.

and rubrical detail. Here, for example, is how the presider's initial approach to the altar is described in Haymo's *ordo*:

Indutus planeta sacerdos stet ante gradum altaris et, iunctis manibus mediocriter elevatis, dicit ant. Introibo ad altare Dei . . .

Deinde facit confessionem absolute, inclinatus mediocriter. Et stat taliter inclinatus donec responsum fuerit Misereatur tui, etc., et tunc erigens, se facit absolutionem. Qua facta dicit V. Deus tu conversus . . . [and the other versicles and responses up to the prayer] Aufer a nobis et cetera. Et dicitur hec oratio aliquantulum alte, dum ascendit sacerdos ad altare . . .

Postea inclinatus coram medio altaris, iunctis manibus, dicit sub silentio hanc orationem. Oramus te domine . . . per merita omnium sanctorum tuorum et cetera. Qua completa, erigit se et manus super altare deponens osculatur illud.⁸⁴

Indutus planeta gives us rather precise details about the presider's vesture, posture, hand positions, and movements as the Mass liturgy begins. But MR1474, while it follows the basic pattern of Haymo's *ordo*, omits many ritual specifics. Thus, while Haymo's text reads, "*Indutus planeta sacerdos stet ante gradum altaris et iunctis manibus mediocriter elevatis . . .*," MR1474 says merely, "*Paratus sacerdos cum intrat ad altare, dicat . . .*"⁸⁵ and omits references to the presider's vesture, posture, or hand positions. Similarly, when it comes to the ritual acts that accompany that portion of the old Roman canon that contains the institution narrative, *Indutus planeta* reads:

Cum vero perventum est ad Qui pridie, ductis plane digitis super pallam altaris, accipit hostiam dicens accepit panem et parum elevans signat eam dicens benedixit et, dicto Hoc est corpus meum et adorato corpore domini cum mediocri inclinatione, elevat illud reverenter ita quod a circumstantibus possit videri. Postea deponit in loco suo.⁸⁶

Once again, the "how-to" directions in MR1474 are quite spare. Just before the words "*Qui pridie*," we find merely "*Hic accipiat hostiam in manibus dicendo*." Similarly, once the words "*Hoc est enim corpus meum*" have been spoken, we find only "*Hic deponat hostiam. et leuet calicem*" (followed by the "*Simili modo*" text that precedes the formula over the chalice).⁸⁷ One may note that neither of these texts includes the modern ritual gestures of genuflection following the words of institution; *Indutus planeta* says "*adorato corpore domini cum mediocri inclinatione*," while MR1474 says nothing at all about ritually reverencing the Lord's body and blood or about showing the consecrated species to the people. In this, MR1474 follows the shorter and more sober rubrics of another medieval

84. Latin text in Stephen J.P. van Dijk, ed., *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Ordinals by Haymo of Faversham (1243–1307)*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1963), Vol. 2, 3–14; here, 3.

85. Lippe, ed., MR1474, no. 1198.

86. van Dijk, *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, Vol. 2, 11.

87. Lippe, ed., MR1474, Vol. 1, 207.

Ordo Missae, “*Paratus*,” which likewise fails to mention either gestures of adoration or elevation of the species following the two consecratory formulas of the institution narrative.⁸⁸

Paratus, *Indutus*, and MR1474 were certainly among the liturgical forbears that influenced the *Ordo [or ritus] servandus* and *Rubricae generales* that accompanied MR1570. But a more important and immediate source for MR1570 was John Burckard’s *Ordo Missae* of 1501.⁸⁹ Burckard was a papal master of ceremonies whose *ordo* opens with a brief biographical note:

Engaged from my youth in the sacred ceremonies, when I saw that not a few priests in the celebration of Mass frequently imitated many abuses, and diverse rites and unsuitable gestures, I thought it unworthy that there is no definite norm transmitted to the priests by the holy Roman Church, Mother and Teacher of all the churches, to be universally observed in the celebration of the Mass.⁹⁰

Uniform practice and universal observance were the goals that prompted Burckard to produce his *Ordo Missae*. From its very beginning, indeed, Burckard’s eye for completeness, precision, and ritual detail is evident. Here, for instance, is his description of how the presider should bless himself at the beginning of Mass:

*Cum sibiipsi benedicit: vertit ad se palmam manus dextre: et omnibus illius digitis iunctis et extensis a fronte quam tangit ad pectus: ac ab humero sinistro ad humerum dextrum signum crucis format.*⁹¹

88. For the text of the *ordo* known as “*Paratus*,” see Iohannes Brinktrine, “*Ordo et Canon Missae* (Cod. Vat. Ottobon. lat. 356),” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 51 (1937): 198–209. *Paratus* is a late-twelfth-century document, composed perhaps fifty years earlier than Haymo’s *Indutus planeta*. See Cassian Folsom, “Gestures Accompanying the Words of Consecration in the History of the *Ordo Missae*,” in Centre International d’Études liturgiques, *The Veneration and Administration of the Eucharist: The Proceedings of the Second International Colloquium of historical, canonical and theological studies on the Roman Catholic Liturgy, Notre-Dame-Du-Laus, France, October 1996* (Southampton, UK: The Saint Austin Press, 1997), 75–94, here, 75–77. *Paratus* appears to reflect liturgical customs of the Roman curia that were in place by the end of the twelfth century. It does indicate that the presider should take the host into his hands “*reverenter*” and to lift it “*iunctis manibus*” just before he begins the text, “*Qui pridie quam pateretur.*”

89. See J. Wickham Legg, ed., *Tracts on the Mass*, Henry Bradshaw Society, vol. 27 (London: Harrison and Sons, 1904), 119–74. See Folsom, “Gestures Accompanying the Words of Consecration,” 78–81. There is some dispute among scholars about the exact date of Burckard’s *ordo*; 1501 or 1507 are the usual dates given.

90. The English translation of the opening of Burckard’s *ordo* is taken from Folsom, “Gestures Accompanying the Words of Consecration,” 78–79. For the Latin text, see Legg, *Tracts on the Mass*, 121 (“*Versatus . . . universaliter observaretur*”).

91. Legg, *Tracts on the Mass*, 133–34. “When he blesses himself, he turns the palm of his right hand toward himself—[with] which hand, with all its fingers joined and extended, he touches from forehead to breast, and from left shoulder to right shoulder, making the sign of the cross” (author’s translation).

Burckard's directions for how the presider should act during the institution narrative of the Eucharistic Prayer are similarly precise. After the words, "*Simili modo posteaquam [sic] cenatum est,*" he instructs the presider to take the chalice into both hands (*amabus manibus*), seizing its base with his left hand and its node with his right, just below the cup; and, with his elbows resting on the altar, standing with head bowed, he says over the chalice—quietly, distinctly, and reverently (*secrete, distincte, et reverenter*)—the words of consecration (*verba consecrationis*).⁹² These directions are familiar to anyone who remembers the *Ordo Missae* of MR1570, as are the instructions Burckard gives to the presider after he has finished pronouncing the words, "*Hoc quotienscumque feceritis: in mei memoriam facietis:*"

*Et genuflexus sanguinem reverenter adorat: tum se erigit: accipit calicem discoopertum cum sanguine ambabus manibus ut prius: eleuat eum quantum commode potest: illum populo ostendens adorandum.*⁹³

Here, we find ritual gestures that have remained part of the Roman Mass from MR1570 to the present.

Although its focus is the presider, Burckard's *ordo* does not utterly ignore others present at the celebration. Thus, he speaks of the role of the assisting acolyte (*minister*), of those who may be present (*interessentes*) at Mass, and of those who wish to make an offering at the preparation of the gifts (*qui volentes offerre*).⁹⁴ He notes that at a Mass which is "read," those present should kneel from the beginning until the celebrant gives the final blessing, except during the gospel, when all should stand attentively.⁹⁵ At a "sung Mass" on Sundays, feasts, or weekdays between Easter and Trinity Sunday, the people kneel only at the confession (*Confiteor*), genuflect to adore the sacrament "when the celebrant shows it to the people," then immediately stand once more until the end of Mass.⁹⁶

Thus, although Burckard's *ordo* gives rubrics for various styles of celebration (e.g., sung Masses and "read" Masses), as well as for varying degrees of solemnity, the basic model seems to be that of the "read" or "low" Mass, with no singing and with minimal activity by the people present (who are to remain kneeling from start to finish, except for the gospel). In its length, precision, scope, and rubrical detail, moreover, Burckard's *ordo* goes well beyond medieval precedents, such as *Indutus planeta* and *Paratus*, documents that are relatively brief by comparison. The same is true of the rubrics and ritual directions contained in MR1474. Thus, while one might logically assume that the latter would

92. *Ibid.*, 157.

93. *Ibid.*; "And genuflecting, he reverently adores the blood. He takes the uncovered chalice, containing the blood, into both hands, as before, and elevates it in as fitting a manner as possible, showing it to the people for adoration" (my translation).

94. *Ibid.*, 134 and 149.

95. *Ibid.*, 134.

96. *Ibid.*

serve as the immediate prototype for *MR1570* (in both its *ordo* and its texts), the provisions of *MR1474* were perceived as “too lean to respond to the pressing need . . . for precise and complete rubrical directives,” and hence recourse was had to the work of John Burckard.⁹⁷

Proximate Ancestors of IGMR

Now we are in a better position to understand how *IGMR2002* combines elements from all these sources to create a new species of liturgical document that is simultaneously liturgical/rubrical, legal/juridical, and theological/pastoral.

1. One should first note that by the time *MR1570* appeared, there was already a distinction of genre between the “*ritus servandus*” (modeled on Burckard’s *ordo*, with precise and abundant detail about how the Roman Mass was to be celebrated) and the *Ordo Missae*. In printed editions of *MR1570*, the *ritus servandus* became a lengthy preface dealing with a full range of ritual and rubrical complexities related to the presider’s role; in contrast, the *Ordo Missae* was a distilled outline of the ordinary, invariable parts of the Mass, printed within the body of the *Missale* itself.⁹⁸ The succinct rubrics found within the *Ordo Missae* were a mnemonic aimed at jogging the memory of the presider, who could then turn to the *ritus servandus* for a more detailed description of his own role and those of the other ministers. This distinction between genres endured; it still appears in *MR2002*, where the detailed, prefatory *IGMR2002* (replacing *MR1570*’s *ritus servandus* and *rubricae generales*) is followed by the *proprium de tempore*, then by texts for the liturgical season *per annum* (including “solemnities of the Lord” that occur in ordinary time), and then by the *Ordo Missae*.⁹⁹

2. When *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (SC) undertook the renewal of the Roman rite in 1963, it proposed not a reform of the rubrics, but a substantial revision of the *Ordo Missae* itself. “The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as well as the connection between them, may be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active

97. Folsom, “Gestures Accompanying the Words of Consecration,” 82.

98. In *MR1570* the *Ordo Missae* (called *ordinarium missae*) follows the liturgical texts and rubrics for the Easter Vigil (“*Sabbato sancto*”). See Manlio Sodi and Achille Maria Triacca, eds., *Missale Romanum Editio Princeps* (1570) (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1998), 293–352 (includes the *Canon missae*). This edition of Sodi and Triacca is a facsimile of the printed *MR1570*, with editorial introduction; page numbers are those of the modern editors. Note that the *ritus servandus* was sometimes supplemented by a “*De defectibus in celebratione missae*.” On the genre distinction between *ritus servandus* and *Ordo Missae*, see Folsom, “Gestures Accompanying the Words of Consecration,” 82.

99. See *Missale Romanum ex decreti sacrosancti oecumenici concilii vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Paul PP. VI promulgatum, Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum*, editio typica tertia (Città del Vaticano: Typis Vaticanis, 2002). The *Ordo Missae* occupies pp. 501–706 of this (altar) edition of *MR2002*; it is immediately followed by the *proprium de sanctis*.

participation by the faithful may be more easily achieved" (SC, no. 50). This is a clear indication that, in the minds of a majority of the bishops at Vatican II (1962–65), the *Ordo Missae* found in then-current editions of the Tridentine missals (including MR1962) was not well suited to "easily achieving" a "devout and active participation by the people." Since SC had already stated that "in the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy the full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else" (no. 14), it was immediately clear that a revision of MR1570's *ritus servandus*—which limited itself primarily to the ritual activities of the presider and said virtually nothing about the role of the people—would need to be set aside or drastically altered.

Still, before such a far-reaching change could occur, SC itself had to be interpreted, and this process began under the direction of the Consilium (or Commission) "for the implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy" created by Pope Paul VI (d. 1978) in January of 1964, with Annibale Bugnini as its secretary.¹⁰⁰ The Consilium immediately set to work, publishing on 26 September 1964 the first of what would become a series of "Instructions" on the "orderly carrying out of the Constitution on the Liturgy," *Inter Oecumenici* (*IntOec*).¹⁰¹ Because the Consilium worked in tandem with what was then called the Congregation of Rites (now the Congregation for Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments), there was intense debate about how much latitude the Consilium had. Cardinal Antonelli, who was then prefect of the Congregation of Rites, believed that when it issued "Instructions," the Consilium could only rubber-stamp the text of SC; it could not propose anything "contrary to or go beyond the Constitution."¹⁰² But members of the Consilium took the view that documents such as *IntOec* were by definition transitional, provisional preliminaries to the more substantial changes envisaged by SC but (for obvious reasons) not yet determined and legislated by SC. As history records, it was the Consilium's view that prevailed and decisively shaped both the reform of the *Ordo Missae* and the provisions of the "General Instruction" that eventually accompanied the revised MR1970.¹⁰³

100. For historical details about the Consilium's creation, see Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 49–53.

101. To date, there have been five such "Instructions," the most recent of which is *Liturgiam Authenticam*, (*LitAuth*) "on the use of vernacular languages in the publication of the books of the Roman liturgy" (28 March 2001).

102. See Folsom, "Gestures Accompanying the Words of Consecration," 83.

103. On the history of how the Consilium, with papal support, gained the upper hand in directing the liturgical reform after the promulgation of SC, see Pietro Marini, "L'Istruzione *Inter Oecumenici*, una svolta decisiva (luglio-Ottobre 1964)," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 108, no. 3 (May–July, 1994): 205–31; idem, "Il Consilium in piena attività in un clima favorevole (Ottobre 1964–Marzo 1965)," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 109, no. 2 (1995): 97–158.

Reshaping the Ordo Missae

The first task facing the Consilium was a reform of the *Ordo Missae* itself, a process that began in 1965 and was completed with the appearance of *MR1970*.¹⁰⁴ Already, in the month that followed the promulgation of *SC*, Pope Paul VI had issued *Sacram liturgiam, motu proprio*, a document that initiated certain changes in the celebration of Mass, the Liturgy of the Hours, and the celebration of the sacraments.¹⁰⁵ Thus, for example, in line with *SC* (no. 52), the pope ordered the inclusion of a homily at Mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation. Paul VI followed this up with a forceful endorsement of preaching in his encyclical *Ecclesiam suam* (6 August 1964), noting that “our ministry before all else . . . is the ministry of the word.”¹⁰⁶ The following month, as noted above, the Consilium issued *IntOec*, which launched the process of reshaping the *Ordo Missae*.¹⁰⁷

We may thus identify stages by which, through documents of the Consilium endorsed by Pope Paul VI, the *Ordo Missae* with which we are familiar today was set in place:

1. **1964:** *IntOec*, which began the important movement toward recognizing both the essential role of the congregation and the diversity of roles required for a eucharistic celebration in which each minister does “all and only” those parts properly assigned to that office (see *SC*, no. 28). This instruction also set in place the procedures by which the “competent authority in liturgical matters” (*SC*, no. 22) was to be established (taking into account the rights of national conferences of bishops, local ordinaries, etc.).

2. **1965:** On 27 January 1965, the Consilium (working through the Congregation of Rites) issued the decree *Nuper edita instructione*, which confirmed the changes to the order of Mass outlined in *IntOec*, revised the 1570 *ritus servandus* to reflect those changes, and ordered that all these alterations be “published and incorporated into any new editions of the *Missale Romanum*, so that the rules contained are exactly observed by all.”¹⁰⁸ In follow-up documents, the Consilium also confirmed new rituals, such as those for concelebration and communion in both kinds (*Ecclesia semper*, 7 March 1965),¹⁰⁹ and affirmed the appropriateness of new arrangements, such as altars facing the people (*Le renouveau liturgique*, 30 June 1965).¹¹⁰ When the Second Vatican Council recon-

104. See Section 2, “The Ordo Missae Prior to 1969,” in DOL, nos. 1338–1356.

105. See DOL, nos. 276–289. The document is dated 25 January 1964. The changes became effective on the First Sunday of Lent in 1964.

106. See DOL, no. 1338.

107. See the text of *IntOec* in DOL, nos. 293–391. The sections dealing with the *Ordo Missae* may be found at DOL, nos. 340–352.

108. See DOL, no. 1340. The precise changes in the *ritus servandus* were listed in the Congregation of Rite’s letter (15 February 1965) to publishers of liturgical books. See the list in *Notitiae* 1 (1965): 215–19.

109. See DOL, nos. 1788–1793.

110. See DOL, nos. 407–418.

vened for its fourth and final session, the Consilium issued a booklet, *Masses for the Fourth Period of Vatican Council II* (14 September 1965), which included the sketch of a revised *Ordo Missae* that reiterated the provisions of *Nuper edita instructione*. Meanwhile, Pope Paul VI continued to express vigorous and vocal support for these unfolding reforms, noting that “for the good of the faithful,” the church “has sacrificed its native tongue, Latin,” calling for assemblies that are “alive and active,” and closing the door on any “return to the former, undisturbed devotion or apathy.”¹¹¹

3. **1967:** By 1967, the Consilium was prepared for a further revision of the *Ordo Missae*, and this was reflected in its second “Instruction on the orderly carrying out of the Constitution on the Liturgy,” *Tres abhinc annos* (4 May 1967, hereafter *TAA*).¹¹² The provisions of *TAA* affected primarily the ritual actions of the presider. They were confirmed and promulgated in a follow-up decree, *Per instructionem alteram* (18 May 1967), which further revised the *ritus servandus* that accompanied printed editions of the *Missale Romanum*. The changes promulgated by the decree *Per instructionem alteram* were published in a small booklet entitled *Variationes in Ordinem Missae inducendae ad normam Instructionis S.R.C. diei 4 maii 1967*.¹¹³ Among the changes introduced were a reduction in repetitive ritual gestures (e.g., genuflections, signs of the cross), as well as repeal of the rubric requiring the presider to hold thumb and forefinger together after the consecration (see *TAA*, nos. 7–12).

4. **1969:** The stage was thus set for a more decisive, permanent reform of the *Ordo Missae*, which occurred, as will be seen in the section that follows, in April of 1969.

Replacing the ritus servandus

As Archbishop Pietro Marini has observed, after the documents *IntOec* (1964), *Nuper edita instructione* (1965), *TAA* (1967), and *Per instructionem alteram* (1967) had appeared, the *ritus servandus* of *MR1570* remained technically in effect, but was so altered by its newly emerging context that, while its letter survived, its spirit did not. Indeed, by the time Pope Paul VI approved a new Missal, with a new *Ordo Missae*, through his apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum* (3 April 1969), the liturgical landscape of the Roman Rite had already changed dramatically. Vernaculars were in use,¹¹⁴ churches were being remodeled, altars were turned so that the presider faced the assembly, homilies at

111. See the texts of Paul VI in DOL, nos. 399–402.

112. See DOL, nos. 445–474.

113. The text of this booklet was printed in *Notitiae* 3 (1967): 195–211. The texts of the old order of celebration (“*vetus ordo*”) are set side by side with the *novus ordo* for easy comparison.

114. On the shift from Latin to the vernaculars, see Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 99–113.

Sunday Mass were the norm, new liturgical ministries were emerging, communion in both kinds was becoming more common, the rites of Holy Week had been further revised, a rite for eucharistic concelebration was in place (see Ostdiek and Ciferni, pp. 281–282 below), and reforms of the Liturgy of the Hours and of other sacramental rites were well underway.

It had become increasingly clear, moreover, that the old *ritus servandus* of MR1570 was becoming obsolete, that it would need not merely revision, but replacement by another kind of document, one that took into account not only differing “degrees” and “styles” of celebration, but the diverse roles of presider, congregation, deacons, readers, servers (acolytes), and musicians. A document was needed, in short, that not only legislated but instructed, that not only regulated rites but reflected on the mysteries being celebrated by God’s “holy people united and arranged under their bishops” (SC, no. 26).

This document was the IGMR, which saw four editions during the period between 1969 and 1975, and was most recently revised in 2002 to accompany the publication of the third *editio typica* of MR2002.¹¹⁵ The same decree that promulgated the Consilium’s *editio typica* of a new *Ordo Missae* (*Ordine Missae*, 6 April 1969) also included, for the first time, an IGMR which “will replace the following preliminaries of the present Roman Missal: *Rubricae generales, Ritus servandus in celebratione et concelebratione Missae; De defectibus in celebratione Missae occurrentibus*.”¹¹⁶ In a subsequent declaration (18 November 1969), the Congregation of Rites clarified the fundamental purposes of the new IGMR:

The Instruction [i.e., IGMR] is an accurate resumé and application of those doctrinal principles and practical norms on the eucharist that are contained in the conciliar Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (4 December 1963), Paul VI’s Encyclical *Mysterium fidei* (3 September 1965), and the Congregation of Rites’ Instruction *Eucharisticum mysterium* (25 May 1967).

Nevertheless the Instruction should not be looked on as a doctrinal, that is to say, dogmatic document. Rather it is a pastoral and ritual instruction: it outlines the celebration and its parts in the light of the doctrinal principles contained in the documents noted. For the rites both have doctrine as their source and give to doctrine its outward expression.

The Instruction thus seeks to provide guidelines for catechesis of the faithful and to offer the main criteria for eucharistic celebration to be used by those who take part in the celebration according to their different orders and ranks.¹¹⁷

This is a crucial text for understanding (a) the nature of an IGMR; (b) the intent of those who crafted the Instruction; and (c) IGMR’s difference from

115. The first edition of IGMR accompanied the Consilium’s publication of the decree *Ordine Missae*, which promulgated the *editio typica* of the new *Ordo Missae* on 6 April 1969.

116. See DOL, no. 1367.

117. DOL, nos. 1368–69.

earlier documents aimed at the “good ordering” of the liturgy (e.g., the *Ritus servandus and Rubricae generales* of MR1570 and subsequent editions of the Tridentine missal). Note that while IGMR faithfully reflects eucharistic doctrine, it “should not be looked on as a . . . dogmatic document.” Its tone and intent are pastoral, practical, and catechetical rather than juridical or dogmatic. Instead of restricting itself to the ritual tasks of the presider alone, IGMR offers “criteria” for all those who “take part in the celebration according to their different orders and ranks.” Moreover, it is not a “document for the ages,” but a set of “guidelines” open to ongoing revision for the sake of “better pastoral and catechetical understanding and for improving rubrics.”¹¹⁸

Indeed, over a period of just five years, IGMR went through four editions. The first of these (published 6 April 1969) was noted above. A second, emended edition appeared when the *Missale Romanum* was promulgated on 26 March 1970.¹¹⁹ Almost immediately, this second edition was further amended, in May of 1970, by a document entitled *Edita instructio*, from the Congregation for Divine Worship (formerly the Congregation of Rites).¹²⁰ The Congregation noted that it was responding to a variety of legitimate “doctrinal and rubrical” comments, but also observed that “some complaints . . . were based on prejudice against anything new,” and that “these were not deemed worth considering because they are groundless.”¹²¹ Once the ministry of subdeacon was suppressed by Paul VI in 1972 (see Morrill and Roll, p. 208), it became necessary to issue a third edition of IGMR, which the Congregation for Divine Worship issued on 23 December 1972.¹²² Three years later, a fourth edition of IGMR appeared to accompany the second *editio typica* of the postconciliar *Missale Romanum* in 1975.¹²³

Finally, with the publication of a third *editio typica* of the postconciliar missal (MR2002), still another, amended version of IGMR was necessary. It is this most recent edition (IGMR2002) that forms the basis for the commentary contained in this volume. We hope the foregoing historical sketch of how documents aimed at the “good ordering of the liturgy” in the Latin West evolved over two millennia will provide a fuller context for understanding how IGMR itself was proposed, promulgated, and subsequently revised in the years between 1969 and 2002.

118. Ibid.

119. The decree of the Congregation for Divine Worship which promulgated the new *Missale Romanum* as reformed after the Second Vatican Council was entitled *Celebrationes eucharisticae*. See DOL, no. 1765.

120. See DOL, no. 1371. The actual changes, most of them quite minor, may be found in *Notitiae* 6 (1970): 177.

121. See DOL, no. 1371.

122. See annotation between DOL, nos. 1371 and 1372.

123. See DOL, nos. 1374–1375 for the decree *Cum Missale Romanum* (27 March 1975), concerning the second *editio typica* of the Roman Missal as reformed after the Second Vatican Council. See also DOL, nos. 1376–1731, for the fourth edition of IGMR.

Liturgy and Ecclesiastical Law

R. Kevin Seasoltz

Post-Conciliar Liturgical Documents in Context

Sacrosanctum Concilium (SC) is a document that is evangelical, theological, juridical, and pastoral. It is evangelical in that it has been framed in the spirit of the New Testament, as the words of the Constitution are often the very words of the Gospel. It is theological in that it elaborates at length the theological foundations for the way in which the Church is sanctified and worships, for example, in Christ and through the power of the Holy Spirit. It is juridical in the sense that it proposes definite practical lines of action in matters of the liturgy. Finally, it is pastoral in that its objective is, as the first paragraph of the document states, “to impart an ever-increasing vigor to the Christian lives of the faithful; to adapt more closely to the needs of our age those institutions which are subject to change; to encourage whatever can promote the union of all who believe in Christ; to strengthen whatever serves to call all of humanity into the Church’s fold” (SC, no. 1).

Most, but not all of the major liturgical documents issued since Vatican II (1962–65) have also been evangelical, theological, juridical, and pastoral. One of the greatest challenges confronting ministers in the Church is to keep these characteristics in a poised tension with one another.¹ Because of background and training, some people respond only to commands and ignore counsels. Such people tend to give little response to the theological values set forth in liturgical documents and often feel free to ignore liturgical reform and renewal unless they are subject to sanctions and commands. Other people, steeped in a legalistic mentality, give a strict juridical interpretation where it least belongs. Failing to understand the constructive nature of Church law, still others manifest only contempt for practical norms in an exaggerated effort to counteract legalism. They are often simply antinomian.

1. An example of a document that is primarily juridical rather than evangelical and theological would be the Instruction *Redemptionis Sacramentum* (RedSac). A recent document that is in fact evangelical, theological, juridical, and pastoral is the *Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy* (DPPL). For a commentary on this document, see *Directory on Popular Piety and the Liturgy: Principles and Guidelines*, ed. Peter C. Phan (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005).

If Christian theology is the science that is founded on the Word that God speaks to us and the tradition of living out that Word faithfully, canon law as a science is concerned with the practical life of the Church founded on God's Word and the living tradition. Although it has God's Word as a primary source, its formulation is the work of those human agents who are responsible for ordering the life of the Church. It is by reflecting on the Word of God and people's faithful living out of that Word that the Church concludes how people should act. As the history of the liturgy shows, in the early centuries of the Church the practical expression of the Church's worship was not separated from its inner spirit. The patristic writers, who were steeped in a theology of the Church and the Church's worship, were also responsible for the concrete expression of the liturgy in the life of the Christian people.

When the Sacred Congregation of Rites and Ceremonies was created in 1588, Pope Sixtus V (d. 1590) manifested a special concern for the interior transformation of the faithful through the Church's liturgy. He stressed that the congregation was established to put into effect and promote the theological and liturgical reforms that were an outgrowth of the Council of Trent (1545–63).² Due to the strong influence of nominalism, which prevailed among the fathers at Trent, the intelligent, meaningful celebration of the liturgy tended to give way to a concern mainly for the validity of the sacraments. In no way did the Council fathers intend to set out a fully developed theology of worship. They were primarily concerned with responding to what they considered the major errors of the Protestant Reformers, and clarifying the minimum requirements for the validity of the seven sacraments. However, in the centuries that followed Trent, the rubrics governing the liturgical rites came to be interpreted simply as rigid norms for mere ceremonial, often devoid of theological significance. As a result there was a widening rift between the theological meaning of the Church's worship and the norms that regulated the external organization and expression of that worship.

Certainly contemporary liturgical theologians have rediscovered the fundamental theological nature of the Church and the Church's worship; hence the emphasis in recent decades has not only been on the validity of the sacraments but also and above all on the meaningful celebration of the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ. The sacraments are not magical sources where people are automatically made holy and assured salvation; they are rather rich and often complex rituals through which women and men as body-persons are transformed and sanctified by Christ in the Spirit, and, in union with Christ and through the power of the Spirit, worship the Father and are transformed in their relations with one another.

If people understand the true nature of liturgical law as a complex system of practical norms ordering the rituals in and through which people are sanctified

2. *Bullarum diplomatum et privilegiorum Romanorum pontificum Taurensis Editio* (1857–67) VIII: 989–90.

and in turn worship God, surely they will admit that a canonical study of the liturgy is important; but ministers who blindly follow the ritual directives in the reformed liturgical books will run the risk of producing a new form of liturgical pageantry that might be externally correct and aesthetically interesting but interiorly dead.

To a great extent competent canonists must depend on the insights of liturgical theologians. Canonical actions should proceed from sound theology. The Church is the living Body of Christ, and its worship is the worship of Christ, who sanctifies the members of his Body and leads them back to the Father through the outpouring of the Spirit. It must be remembered, however, that the Spirit was not given once and for all on Pentecost but is continually being poured out on all of God's people. Hence, in order that the new inspirations of the Spirit might be put into practice, the legal requirements must be formulated in such a way that there is still room for growth and development. If the practical life of the Church is to reflect the ever-deepening understanding of the faith and the development of doctrine, it is imperative that the body of the Church's law should have an elastic quality so that new insights may be assimilated to what is already good in the Church's life.³

SC certainly established the principle of historical relevance; the document conceives of the people of God in a historical context. That history is constantly changing, revealing God to God's people in varying ways. The Constitution does not visualize a fully developed form of worship that the Church is to impose on all people for all time, but leaves open the possibility that new forms of worship may always be accepted if they are recommended as being the fruit of serious scholarship and experience and are felt to be beneficial to the Church as it exists in concrete situations.⁴

Furthermore, the Constitution is based on the principle of personal and communal consciousness and responsibility. Ritual forms can be controlled, but worship itself cannot be legislated, for it is the free and loving response of human persons and communities to a loving God. When good laws are internalized in personal and communal consciences, when people have an awareness of God's power to save them and of God's desire to save them through the liturgy of the Church, the written law of the Church does not have to address minute details.⁵ Liturgical ministers should be aware of the canonical axiom derived from Roman law: *De minimis non curat praetor* ("the lawgiver is not concerned with minutiae"). That means that sometimes matters are of such

3. See Ladislav Örsy, "Theology and Canon Law," in *The New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, ed. John P. Beal, James A. Coriden, and Thomas J. Green (New York: Paulist Press, 2000), 1–9.

4. See Mark R. Francis, *Shape a Circle Ever Wider: Liturgical Inculturation in the United States* (Chicago: Liturgical Training Publications, 2000), 48–77.

5. David Granfield, *The Inner Experience of Law: A Jurisprudence of Subjectivity* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1988).

minimal significance that it is not appropriate to make them the object of a canonical norm. Likewise symbols and rituals not explicitly authorized are sometimes introduced into celebrations, but they are of such minor importance that they do not call for specific authorization. Examples would be the introduction of additional popular acclamations into the structure of the Eucharistic Prayer so as to provide more active participation on the part of the community, or the introduction of liturgical dance and gestures at various appropriate times during the liturgy.⁶

When consciences have been well formed and sound theological awareness has been deepened, it is best that Church laws emphasize only the basic norms and principles. In this way there is room for the free development and assimilation of wholesome customs and usages. This is the best way of promoting that unity in diversity that should characterize the Church of Jesus Christ.

Certainly *SC* and most of the liturgical documents issued in the decades immediately following Vatican II were formulated in that spirit. The norms were general and were concerned with major issues, not with picayune details. For example, in matters of liturgical music and liturgical architecture and art, only directives of a very general nature were issued, and rightly so, for the creation of art, like morality, is something that cannot be legislated. Artists, architects, and musicians who agree to work for the Church should acknowledge that they are ministers, servants of the Church; hence they should have a clear understanding of the theology of the liturgy and the role of their proper arts in the liturgy, but talent and genius should not be stifled by legislators who are not themselves conversant with the arts. It is above all in these areas that the law should not go into great detail once the role of the arts in the liturgy has been established. This seems to have been the attitude behind the formulation of chapters six and seven in *SC*.

In the years following Vatican II, provision was made for experimentation before final texts were promulgated. In many instances options were given in the celebration of the liturgy. Extensive power was transferred from the Holy See and placed in the hands of national episcopates, thus providing for more diversification in the Church's rites as determined by culture and need. In more recent times, however, much power has been transferred back into the hands of the Holy See; options have been limited; and cultural adaptation has been restricted.⁷

6. See Lucien Deiss, *Spirit and Song in the New Liturgy*, rev. ed. (Cincinnati: World Library Publications, 1976), 91–99.

7. See, for example, Congregatio de Cultu Divino et Disciplina Sacramentorum, "Instructio quinta ad executionem Constitutionis Concilii Vaticani Secundi de Sacra Liturgia recte ordinandam: De Usu Linguarum Popularium in Libris Liturgicae Romanae Edendis" (28 March 2001) *AAS* 93 (2001): 685–726; idem, "Instructio de quibusdam observandis et vitandis circa sanctissimam Eucharistiam," (25 March 2004) *AAS* 96 (2004): 549–601.

The primary liturgical issues that continue to challenge Catholic communities are how to implement to best advantage the reform measures embodied in the revised service books; how to foster the growth of faith communities that can genuinely express their Christian life and deepen that life in the liturgical forms approved by the Church; how to carry out the liturgical catechesis that is always essential to liturgical renewal; and how to be liturgically creative and responsive to pastoral needs without being antinomian or frivolously iconoclastic.⁸ These issues, however, must be confronted along with the complicated question of how one should maintain fidelity to clearly established norms while being pastorally responsible. The challenge is underlined in article 11 of SC: "Pastors . . . must realize that, when the liturgy is celebrated, their obligation goes further than simply ensuring that the laws governing valid and lawful celebrations are observed. They must also ensure that the faithful take part fully aware of what they are doing, actively engaged in the rite and enriched by it."

The text is clear that the responsibility of ministers is not only to the faithful observance of norms but also to the enrichment of the Christian lives of all those who take part in the celebrations. No longer may ministers feel that they have done their duty if they have carried out the norms in the liturgical books; they must go beyond the norms, in the sense that they must lead the people in bringing the liturgy to life. Consequently, they must develop a ministerial style that enables them to be aware of the pastoral needs of the people and to structure and execute the rites in such a way that they truly respond to people's needs. This presupposes an understanding of both the theological and aesthetic dimensions of the liturgy. Without undermining liturgical discipline, ministers may and should explore opportunities for creativity within the liturgical celebrations.⁹

A pastoral, responsible, and creative approach to the interpretation of liturgical law was taken by the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales in their 2005 response to the publication of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* 2002 (*IGMR2002*). The bishops did not issue an English translation of the *IGMR2002* until April 2005. At the same time that they issued the translation, they released a carefully nuanced pastoral introduction, *Celebrating the Mass*.¹⁰ Sound theological observations are carefully woven throughout the commentary. It is, however, the bishops' pastoral interpretations of what otherwise might be interpreted as restrictive directives in *IGMR2002* that are especially

8. Frederick R. McManus, "Liturgical Law and Difficult Cases," *Worship* 48 (1974): 347.

9. E. Dekkers, "Créativité dans la liturgie d'aujourd'hui," *Notitiae* 8 (1972): 151-56; D. Hameline, "La créativité: Fortune d'un concept, ou concept de fortune?" *La Maison-Dieu* 111 (1972): 84-109.

10. Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *Celebrating the Mass: A Pastoral Introduction* (London: Catholic Truth Society and Colloquium, 2005). There is no indication that this document was first of all submitted to the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments for approval before publication.

refreshing. For example, the movements and postures of the assembly are carefully regulated in *IGMR2002*, nos. 42–44. Rather than insisting on uniformity throughout the two countries, the English and Welsh bishops allow for a variety of possibilities and for local variations in their commentary: “Within the dioceses of England and Wales different communities will have preference for different posture” (no. 61). In the matter of vesture, the bishops do not insist that the chasuble be worn over the stole as indicated in *IGMR2002*, no. 337. The bishops are aware that many parishes and religious communities have, since the Second Vatican Council, purchased expensive vestments designed in such a way that the stole must be worn over the chasuble. So as not to insist that such vestments be discarded, the bishops simply state in their document: “The chasuble, worn with alb and stole, is the proper vestment of the presiding priest” (no. 111). They likewise take a sound pastoral approach in their commentary on *IGMR2002*, no. 308 which states: “There is also to be a cross, with the figure of Christ crucified upon it. . . .” In *Celebrating the Mass*, the bishops of England and Wales state: “It is usual for this Cross to bear a figure of Christ crucified. However, in the tradition of the Church the saving mystery of the Crucified One has been represented in different ways, sometimes by a figure of the suffering or dead Christ on the cross, sometimes by a figure showing the Resurrected Lord standing in triumph as King or High Priest at the cross, sometimes without representation of the person of the Lord but simply by a plain cross” (no. 104). *Celebrating the Mass* is an excellent example of liturgical law that is flexible, pastoral, and creative.

Legitimate Legislators

In the early centuries of the Church, the bishops were responsible for the liturgy in their dioceses, not the bishop of Rome. Consequently there were different liturgical practices in various dioceses even in the West; no centralized authority attempted to impose liturgical uniformity.¹¹ The local bishop was both a member of the local community and also one who had the distinctive roles of leader, teacher, and symbol of unity in the community. He was free to adapt the liturgy to the needs of the local community.¹² Gradually, however, ecumenical councils began to assert authority over local liturgies. Furthermore the gradual increase in papal authority was joined with an increase in the prestige of Roman practices, resulting in a more uniform practice of liturgy in the West.¹³ In the eighth and ninth centuries, the Carolingian emperors tried to

11. See Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 73–117; Marcel Metzger, *History of the Liturgy: The Major Stages* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997), 16–112. Also, Mitchell and Baldovin, 11 above.

12. John R. Rotelle, “Liturgy and Authority,” *Worship* 47 (1973): 515–24; J. Colson, “Le rôle du presbytérium et l’évêque dans le contrôle de la liturgie chez saint Ignace d’Antioche et le rôle de Rome au IIe siècle,” *Pariosse et Liturgie* 47 (1965): 14–24.

13. Metzger, 116–19; also, Mitchell and Baldovin, 11 above.

impose the Roman practice of liturgy throughout their empires as an effective way to establish both political and ecclesial unity. Despite this trend, however, many bishops continued to take responsibility for the liturgy in their respective dioceses.¹⁴

Charlemagne (d. 814) asked Pope Hadrian I (d. 795) to send him a purely Roman sacramentary. The text was placed in the royal palace in Aachen and served as a model which was copied by many scribes and then diffused throughout the Carolingian Empire. This contributed to the demise of oral traditions in liturgical matters, since local oral traditions were gradually replaced by written directives, which were eventually codified and gained in prestige because the Roman liturgical texts were considered the work of the popes themselves, including the highly respected Gregory the Great (d. 604). Beginning in the tenth and eleventh centuries the texts for diverse liturgical ministries were brought together in complete books. These books, however, contained not only the liturgy as celebrated in Rome but also additions from the churches of the Carolingian Empire. Somewhat later, these same hybrid books were adopted by the Church in Rome, especially during the reform of Pope Gregory VII (1073–1085). After this the rites of the Roman Church did not change much but were stabilized in their principal forms.¹⁵

The Roman liturgy of the late Middle Ages, propagated very widely by the Franciscans and other mendicant orders of the thirteenth century, was essentially the rite that came down to the fathers at the Council of Trent and made its way into the post-Tridentine liturgical books.¹⁶ These liturgical books generally replaced all other local rites in the West. As a result, the publication of the Tridentine liturgical books had the effect of suppressing the ancient notion that the bishop was the chief liturgical legislator for his diocese; the Apostolic See assumed that role for the whole Latin Church.

According to the 1917 Code of Canon Law (*CIC1917*), only the Apostolic See could enact liturgical laws (c. 1257). Diocesan bishops possessed only what might be called a “negative” legislative authority in liturgical matters, since they could pass laws only to enforce the observance of the canonical rules and decrees of the Apostolic See on divine worship.¹⁷ Their primary role was one of supervision, to see that canon law was faithfully observed in their dioceses

14. *Ibid.*, 114–16; also, Mitchell and Baldwin, 11 above.

15. See Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. William Storey and Niels Rasmussen (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1986), 31–59; Eric Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 19–56; also, Mitchell and Baldwin, 5–22 above.

16. See Stephen J. P. Van Dijk, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century* (Westminster: Newman, 1960); also, Mitchell and Baldwin, 18–20 above.

17. Frederick R. McManus, “The Juridical Power of the Bishop in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,” *Concilium* 2 (New York: Paulist Press, 1964), 36–37.

and that abuses were prevented.¹⁸ In his 1947 encyclical *Mediator Dei*, Pope Pius XII (d. 1958) accurately reflected the mind of *CIC1917* when he clearly stated that “the supreme pontiff alone has the right to permit or establish any liturgical practice, to introduce or approve new rites, or to make any changes in them he considers necessary.” The bishops were “to enforce diligently the observance of the canonical rules on divine worship” (*Mediator Dei*, no. 58). *SC* altered the law in *CIC1917* by giving diocesan bishops real authority over the liturgy: “Regulation of the liturgy depends solely on the authority of the Church, that is, on the Apostolic See and, accordingly as the law determines, on the bishop” (no. 22). However, Vatican II did not fully restore to diocesan bishops the wide authority they had over the liturgy before the Council of Trent. *SC* gave limited authority to episcopal conferences, which was further defined in the Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church, *Christus Dominus*.¹⁹

Current Sources of Liturgical Law

Liturgical law is undoubtedly the largest body of Roman Catholic ecclesiastical law, with countless universal laws in the approved liturgical books, in Book IV of the 1983 Code of Canon Law (*CIC1983*) on “The Office of Sanctifying in the Church,” in parts of Book III on “The Teaching Function of the Church,” and in papal laws outside the code. There are also numerous laws regulating the liturgy that have been enacted by conferences of bishops and dioceses throughout the world. Additionally, the Roman dicasteries have issued various documents on the liturgy, some of which are legislative, others, administrative. These norms constitute part of a complex canonical system that requires skills in both interpreting and applying laws. It is, however, a system that often lies beyond the understanding and competence of most pastoral ministers who are nonetheless responsible for planning and celebrating liturgies. Liturgical laws are subject to the same principles of interpretation and dispensation as other ecclesiastical laws.²⁰

Two principal sources of liturgical law are the *praenotandae* (introductions) and rubrics of the various approved liturgical books. The *praenotandae* provide theological background and the major disciplinary regulations affecting the preparation and celebration of rites. The rubrics, which are found throughout the liturgical books, usually provide more precise directions, specifying what the ministers or assembly should say or do at a specific time in the celebration. Liturgical manuals have traditionally described rubrics as preceptive, directive,

18. See 1917 *Codex Iuris Canonici (CIC1917)*, cc. 336 and 1261.

19. *Christus Dominus*, nos. 37–38. See Frederick R. McManus, “The Scope of Authority of Episcopal Conferences,” in *The Once and Future Church*, ed. James A. Coriden (New York: Alba House, 1971), 129–78; and Julio Manzanares Marijuan, *Liturgia y Descentralización en el Concilio Vaticano II*, *Analecta Gregoriana* 177 (Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1970).

20. See John M. Huels, “The Interpretation of Liturgical Law” (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Canon Law Studies, 1981), 11–28.

or facultative. For example, the directive in *IGMR2002* which states that the presider “selects a Eucharistic Prayer from those found in the *Roman Missal* or approved by the Apostolic See” (no. 147) is a preceptive rubric; whereas that which states that “the priest may say the formulas of blessing aloud” (no. 142), is a facultative rubric. Preceptive rubrics are binding, while directive or non-preceptive rubrics are not strictly binding. Facultative rubrics provide some choice or option.

It is well known among canonists that Roman law has had major influence on the general norms that have been incorporated in both *CIC1917* and *CIC1983* and also on the canons that deal with canonical procedures.²¹ There are, however, two major differences between Roman law and Anglo-Saxon law that have very important implications for the way English-speaking Catholics, especially in North America and the United Kingdom, interpret canon law in general and liturgical law in particular.

The first principle is that in Roman law there is clear allowance for the progressive evolution of its institutes and the consequent necessity of keeping the law in step with the development of the institutes. In a sense, then, theory and practice in Roman law are often out in front of the written law itself. Roman law would therefore allow for the development of doctrine and also for the development of customs, even those contrary to law. By contrast, Anglo-Saxon law does not make allowance for the progressive evolution of its institutes; if there is to be allowance for changed practice, the law itself must first of all be changed. Anglo-Saxon jurists would maintain that they should adhere to the precise words of a legal text, since the precise meaning of the words has been locked into place at the time the text was written. Roman jurists would argue that the genius of a law is that it rests not in any static meaning it might have had in a world that is dead and gone, but in the adaptability of juridic principles that enable governments and other administrators to cope with current problems.

The second principle is that in Roman law there seems to be a penchant for articulating universal laws, while at the same time making allowance for generous dispensations. In Anglo-Saxon law, however, the law itself must be changed if there is to be a legitimate change in practice. In other words, Roman law is more dynamic while Anglo-Saxon law is more static. Difficulty naturally arises for English-speaking North American Catholics, because they tend to use the rigid principles of Anglo-Saxon law to interpret canon law in general and liturgical law in particular, with the result that they are often much more rigorous than the law ever intended them to be. In other words, those influenced by an Anglo-Saxon worldview tend to give an overly literal interpretation to documents while those from the Mediterranean, whose national laws are clearly

21. See Barry Nichols, *An Introduction to Roman Law* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962); Albert Gauthier, *Roman Law and Its Contribution to the Development of Canon Law* (Ottawa: Saint Paul University, 1996).

based on Roman law, have developed ways of interpreting canon law in general and liturgical law in particular that are much more relaxed and liberating. The major differences between Roman law and Anglo-Saxon law must be kept in mind when discussing the various current sources of liturgical law.

Vatican II's discipline regarding the competence of various authorities over the liturgy was largely incorporated in *CIC1983*. Diocesan bishops have limited authority over the liturgy, even though "they are high priests, principal dispensers of the mysteries of God and moderators, promoters and custodians of the whole liturgical life of the church committed to them" (c. 835). They do have general legislative power for their dioceses (c. 391) but can only make laws that are not contrary to universal law (c. 135, par. 2).

As for the liturgical competence of episcopal conferences, the code mentions only that these national bodies may prepare translations of the liturgical books into the vernacular and make adaptations in the liturgy permitted by the liturgical books themselves (c. 838, par. 3). The matter of translating liturgical texts, however, has been treated extensively in *Liturgiam Authenticam (LitAuth)*.²² The conferences of bishops must approve translations of liturgical texts. For English-speaking conferences the translations are prepared by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL). Once the bishops have approved a translation, it requires confirmation (*recognitio*) by the Holy See before it may be used in the liturgy. An international group of bishops, the *Vox Clara* Committee, advises on questions of English translation (see no. 392 below). In cases where the universal law does not specify that episcopal conferences may legislate, a conference must obtain permission from the Holy See to do so. Whether the permission to legislate comes by way of the law itself or from the Holy See, a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the conference is always necessary for a decision to be binding in that conference's territory, and before the decision may be promulgated it must be reviewed and approved by the Apostolic See (c. 455).

One of the useful ways that subsidiarity is fostered in the Church is through the power of diocesan bishops to dispense from universal laws. Canon 85 states that a dispensation is the relaxation of a merely ecclesiastical law in a particular case. Whenever the diocesan bishop judges that it will benefit the spiritual good of the faithful, he may dispense from all disciplinary laws, whether universal or particular, except those laws whose dispensation is reserved to the Apostolic See (c. 870). For the validity of a dispensation, there must be a just and reasonable cause (c. 90). Not all laws, however, may be dispensed. By definition, only ecclesiastical laws may be dispensed, not divine laws, and even among merely ecclesiastical laws, there are three categories of law which cannot be dispensed: procedural laws, penal laws, and constitutive laws which define the essential elements necessary to constitute a juridical institute or act (c. 86). For example,

22. For a detailed commentary on this instruction, see Peter Jeffery, *Translating Tradition: A Chant Historian Reads Liturgiam Authenticam* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005).

a bishop could not dispense from the matter and form of a sacrament because without them there would be no sacrament. He could, however, dispense from a regulation requiring that the wine to be consecrated during the Eucharist should be placed in chalices at the preparation of the gifts rather than consecrated in a decanter placed on the altar. Likewise, he could dispense from the liturgical law in the United States that directs that the faithful should kneel during the Eucharistic Prayer from the end of the *Sanctus* until after the Great Amen concluding the Eucharistic Prayer. For the most part, liturgical laws are disciplinary laws, not divine, constitutive, penal, or procedural; hence they are subject to dispensation.

Another way in which subsidiarity can be fostered is by the petition for and granting of indulgences. The term “indulgence” designates a special favor given for a determinate period of time; it is distinguished from a privilege which is a special favor granted in perpetuity. For example, a bishop might petition the Holy See and be given an indulgence to allow lay men and women to give a homily during the celebration of the Eucharist because the presider does not speak well the language in which the liturgy is being celebrated.

Closely related to the understanding of liturgical law is the role that custom plays in the interpretation of law. Canon 27 of *CIC1983* states that “custom is the best interpreter of the law.”²³ Adapted from Roman law, this maxim has long been an accepted principle of canonical interpretation. It shows that the Church’s legal system has great respect for the sound practices of a community. Hence, one of the best ways to learn how a law is to be understood and put into practice is to look at the ways a local Catholic community actually observes a law.

Throughout history local customs have exercised a far greater role in the development of the liturgy than has canon law. Local customs have varied from one diocese to another and often from one parish to another. The role of custom in the Church’s worship, however, greatly diminished following the Council of Trent and the publication of the reformed liturgical books.

CIC1983 treats custom in cc. 23–28 and speaks of customs in accord with the law, apart from the law, and contrary to the law. Customs in accord with the law simply support and flesh out the spirit and letter of the written law; certainly there should be no objection to such customs. Customs apart from the law are those which the law does not regulate at all; they may be laudable or they may be abusive. Customs contrary to the law are those which are against the law and clearly violate the spirit and letter of the law. Customs apart from or contrary to the law do not readily become recognized as legitimate in terms of canon law. However, customs apart from or contrary to the law can play an important role in the local church’s adaptation of the liturgy to its pastoral

23. See John M. Huels, “Back to the Future: The Role of Custom in a World Church,” *Canon Law Society of America Proceedings* 59 (1997): 1–25.

needs. For example, in most parishes in this country, it has been the common practice for the presider at the Mass of the Lord's Supper on Holy Thursday to wash the feet of women as well as men even though this is in violation of the rubric in the Sacramentary that specifies men (*viri*). Such a practice reminds the assembly that all in the Church are called both to be served and to serve. Such a custom, even though it may be contrary to the letter of the law, actually upholds the law's basic spirit and Gospel purpose and therefore should be both tolerated and encouraged throughout the country.

It should be noted, however, that not all customs should be tolerated. Often they can be real abuses of the liturgy that result from negligence, ignorance, pastoral insensitivity, or indifference on the part of liturgical ministers. For example, it is a clear abuse for a presider to omit the homily on Sundays and holy days; likewise, it is an abuse for the presider never to offer the chalice to the assembly. It takes a well-informed interpreter to know the difference between an abuse and a legitimate custom that is contrary to the law. Such an interpreter knows not only what the law says but also discerns the pastoral context and has some understanding of the history, structure, and theology of the liturgy in general and a detailed knowledge of the pastoral context in question.

Interpretation of Liturgical Law

In the 1960s and 1970s canonists often tried to help their brothers and sisters understand the nature, role, and interpretation of official liturgical documents and laws, but they tended to approach the problem simply in terms of authority and obedience. That approach, however, overlooked a more fundamental question, that of hermeneutics that tends to cast the issue not in terms of authority and obedience but in terms of prudence: doing the right thing at the right time for the right reason. This approach leads to much more flexibility and also to a greater sense of personal and communal responsibility, creativity, and pastoral sensitivity. Sound interpretation is a complex task, but when it is properly understood both by the lawmakers and by those for whom laws are intended, then much of the tension between authority figures and the rest of the community is apt to be reduced or even eliminated.

The current interest in canonical hermeneutics has been inspired to a great extent by the writings of Ladislav Örsy, whose basic approach is set out in certain qualities of the interpreters and in specific rules of interpretation.²⁴ Interpreters should be aware that their interpretation is always a historical occurrence in two ways: they describe the law at a specific time in history and their capacity to understand occurs at a specific point of development. This principle does not relativize all knowledge, but it reminds us that our grasp of knowledge is always relative to what is absolute. There is an evolutionary character to laws;

24. Ladislav Örsy, *Theology and Canon Law: New Horizons for Legislation and Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 53–82.

hence interpreters should know to what point in history the law has evolved. Likewise, the interpreters do not stand still but are always involved in history too; they are developing all the time. Consequently, an interpreter might give one interpretation to a law at one time and a different interpretation ten years later, because both the value that the law intends to uphold and the experience and horizon of the interpreter have developed over the years.

The second quality of the interpreter is that the broader the horizon of the interpreter, the closer the interpreter's interpretation is apt to be to the truth. Horizon means the extent of the field that the understanding of the interpreter can embrace. Canon lawyers who are *merely* lawyers cannot grasp the full meaning of ecclesiastical laws. Since the whole discipline of canon law is rooted in Christian doctrine and its systematic understanding, in order to grasp the correct legal meaning the interpreter must go back to the doctrinal roots. Furthermore, Christian faith cannot be properly understood apart from those auxiliary disciplines, such as philosophy, anthropology, psychology, and sociology, which affect the development of Christian doctrine. It is within that broad context that laws exist. To grasp the meaning of the laws, interpreters need to grasp the broad context.

It follows then that interpreters who can approach the law with broad and sophisticated categories are more likely to find the right meaning. If canon lawyers wish to understand and grasp the real meaning of laws, they need to look for help in the fields of other sciences. What has become increasingly clear since the Second Vatican Council is that liturgical studies is increasingly an interdisciplinary field of investigation. Canon lawyers who interpret liturgical laws need to recognize the interdisciplinary foundation on which liturgical laws are based and interpret the laws accordingly.

Against the background of his rules for interpreters, Örsy sets out his guiding principles for interpretation. He reminds us that every legal norm is a child of history. To grasp the meaning of a norm, one should know the history of the law. Furthermore, the meaning of every norm depends on its literary form. A commonly accepted hermeneutical principle in the study of Scripture has shown the need to identify the literary form of a text. Örsy has shown that literary forms also exist in canon law. The literary forms of canon law may be divided into proclamations of doctrine and norms of action. When the origin of a law lies in a theory, one must go back to the theory to understand the meaning of the law. Here theory means the basic doctrine that inspired the law in the first place. Likewise, the legislator cannot speak or write except within his own cultural context. Hence one must know something of the cultural background of the person who wrote the law and also the cultural background of the interpreter. Is the person inclined to be rigorous or flexible? Just as the mission of the Church is to be a light to the world, so the Church's laws should show forth the wisdom of the Church to all people. The interpretation of canon law must be faithful to sound ecclesiological principles. If the interpretation of church

laws does not show them to be expressions of wisdom and responsibility for all people, they are not adequate interpretations—or perhaps the laws are simply unreasonable. If a law is clearly unjust, it certainly cannot be a reasonable law of the Church, for canon law is meant to uphold Christian values and the dignity of human persons.

The primary purpose of liturgical law is to protect the fundamental structures of the liturgy and thereby uphold the unity and catholicity of the liturgy itself in the interest of the good order of the whole Church. All laws should seek to promote unity, order, and the common good, but liturgical law is a unique kind of law, so its interpretation must be rather different in some respects from that of other disciplinary laws. The difference stems from the uniqueness of the liturgy itself. Liturgy speaks the language of symbol and mystery, a language involving dimensions that go beyond the proper realm of law. It is living and dynamic, and its fundamental elements require fresh and creative expressions according to the varying cultures and particular needs of local churches. Thus, not only must liturgical law seek to protect the foundational elements of the liturgy, it must also facilitate the fruitful experience and celebration of liturgical rites by the faithful. In short, liturgical law must be pastorally oriented. It must enhance the spiritual and pastoral good of the worshipping community by promoting effective celebrations of the paschal mystery.

Universal laws are meant for the universal Church. If a law cannot be readily observed in a third-world country, it is not then a universal law. What might be an ideal practice in theory is not always ideal in practice. In the Christian community, law is there to support values; when the observance of a law becomes a sheer formality, it collapses and ceases to exist. Furthermore, the meaning of a single norm must be understood in the context of a whole system. If an interpreter has a good grasp of the characteristics of canon law as a whole, this knowledge will provide a much broader basis for skillfully interpreting liturgical laws. Of course all interpreters must keep in mind the final canon of *CIC1983*, which asserts that the salvation of souls is the supreme law in the Church.²⁵

Every rule has its own authority; hence church laws are weighted differently. Francis Morrisey, the distinguished Canadian canon lawyer, has identified numerous types of pronouncements made by various popes and curial dicasteries in recent decades.²⁶ It should be noted first of all that the constitutions promulgated by the Second Vatican Council, including *SC*, are most important. Hence *CIC1983* and other liturgical documents emanating from the Holy See should be interpreted in light of *SC*, not vice versa.

25. *servata aequitate canonica et prae oculis habita salute animarum, quae in Ecclesia suprema semper lex esse debet* (c. 1752).

26. Francis G. Morrisey, *Papal and Curial Pronouncements: Their Canonical Significance in Light of the Code of Canon Law* (Ottawa: Saint Paul University, 1995).

Major legislative texts and liturgical books, such as *CIC1983* and the Roman Missal (*MR2002*), were promulgated by the pope by means of an apostolic constitution, which is the highest kind of document issued by the pope. Such documents are both doctrinal and disciplinary in content and deal with matters of great importance. Another form for papal legislation is the apostolic letter *motu proprio*, so-called because the pope acts on his own initiative. Such documents address serious topics and are generally legislative in nature and so affect the whole Latin Church.

Encyclicals are papal acts in the form of letters; they are an expression of the pope's ordinary teaching authority; their contents are presumed to belong to the ordinary magisterium unless the opposite is clearly stated. Because of this, the teaching of an encyclical is capable of being changed on specific points of detail. They are usually addressed to the entire world and are not generally used for dogmatic definitions but rather to give counsel or to shed light on points of doctrine which must be made more precise or which must be taught in view of specific circumstances in various countries. They can in fact abrogate or derogate from earlier legislation. Pope John Paul II (d. 2005) issued many encyclicals, including letters such as *Ut Unum Sint* and *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*,²⁷ both of which addressed important liturgical issues.

The Roman curia, as an executive arm of the papacy and its various dicasteries, cannot enact laws except in particular cases when this power has been expressly granted to them by the pope (*CIC1983*, c. 30). Such curial documents fall into the category of "general decrees." Many documents pertaining to the liturgical reform have been issued by means of curial decrees, including the various sections of the revised liturgical books. Decrees have the same weight as the canons of *CIC1983*.

One of the more common forms of curial documents issued in recent years is the instruction (*instructio*), which is an act of executive power of lesser juridic weight than a legislative text such as *IGMR2002*. Instructions cannot alter either universal or particular laws. However, if an instruction concludes with the words "everything to the contrary notwithstanding" (*Contrariis omnibus quibuslibet non obstantibus*), it means that such a decree is legislative due to the papal mandate given to the congregation to promulgate the document. It is significant that the instruction *RedSac* was prepared by the Congregation for Divine Worship by mandate of the pope in collaboration with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and was approved by the pope.²⁸

Although familiarity with the distinctions among various kinds of church documents is important for good interpretation, it is not among the most important factors. All the laws found in a liturgical book have the same extrinsic

27. AAS 87 (1995): 921–82, and AAS 95 (2003): 433–75.

28. See John M. Huels, "Canonical Observations on *Redemptionis Sacramentum*," *Worship* 78 (2004): 404–20.

force arising from the legislator who promulgated the book, yet the many individual norms within the book can have very different degrees of intrinsic binding force depending on other factors, such as their literary form or their perceived importance to the Christian community. For example, *MR2002* was promulgated by means of an apostolic constitution, and the norms of its *IGMR2002* as well as its rubrics all have the force of papal law. Yet anyone with even an elementary knowledge of the structure of the Eucharist would never equate in importance the rubric governing the presider's washing of hands with that concerning the transformation of the bread and wine through the Eucharistic Prayer. Obviously there is more to interpretation than learning a few rules pertinent to the text of the laws; the more difficult endeavor is to interpret the law properly according to its total context, including its historical and theological contexts.

There are two relatively new forms of documents emanating from the Holy See. One takes the form of a circular letter which outlines procedures and indicates new obligations. Since circular letters are never published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis (AAS)*, they are not legislative documents in the strict sense but are simply effective means of expressing the policies and intentions of various congregations. The other type of document is the directory which contains guidelines for the application of accepted principles. Examples would include the Directory for Masses with Children and the various editions of the Directory for the Application of the Principles and Norms of Ecumenism.

A longstanding canonical axiom states that "favours are to be multiplied; burdens are to be restricted." In other words persons should interpret laws broadly when such an interpretation is favorable to them; they should give a strict interpretation when individual rights or other values are apt to be compromised or harmed. Broad interpretation stretches the meaning of a legal text in order to allow the most favorable interpretation without going beyond the actual meaning of the words of the law. Strict interpretation limits the application of the law to those situations and under the minimal conditions that are specified in the law. According to c. 18, strict interpretation is required of all laws that establish a penalty, restrict the free exercise of human rights, or contain an exception to the law. As a general rule, liturgical law is subject to broad interpretation rather than strict interpretation.

The Eastern Catholic Churches have long been comfortable with the assertion that acceptance by the community is a requisite for the reasonableness and hence the authority of a church law. A law may be so far removed from the goal it intends to achieve and so foreign to the experiences and cultural situations of a community that it can in no way function as an effective law for such a community. There are three long-standing canonical principles that should regularly be kept in mind when applying liturgical laws. The first is: observe economy. The principle of economy (from the Greek *oikonomia* meaning management or stewardship) implies that church administrators should imitate

God's stewardship over human salvation. In the tradition of the Eastern Churches, economy means both the prudent management of the Church and accommodation, adaptation, or compromise in certain matters. It flows from the contemplation of God's just and merciful purpose and presence in the Church, and it can sometimes lead beyond the limits of the Church's law. Economy is not so much an exception to the law as an obligation to decide individual issues in the general context of God's plan for the salvation of the world.²⁹

The second principle is: remember *epikeia*. *Epikēia* is a virtue, a part of justice, that enables one to correct deficiencies in general rules when they are applied to particular situations. It enables one to take account of the inherent inadequacy of all human laws by applying them sensibly and wisely to individual cases. Hence the application of *epikēia* is morally superior to a merely verbal or rigid application of rules, and therefore is a better form of justice.³⁰

The third principle is: do equity. In canon law equity is to govern the application of norms to concrete cases. It takes the form of mercy and pastoral charity, and seeks not a rigid application of the law but the true welfare of the faithful. Canonical equity is the fruit of kindness and charity. It understands that the ideal of justice is actually realized in fair decisions, that justice should be tempered by mercy, and the rigor of justice should be conditioned by charity.³¹

In the application of liturgical laws, these principles are in keeping with the medieval axiom that "sacraments are for people" (*sacramenta sunt propter homines*); people do not exist for the sacraments. The Church is likewise for people; people do not exist for the Church. For example, in communities that are seeking to be responsible and committed to efforts to assure justice for women and minorities in the Church, the use of sexist or exclusive language in the liturgy is often both irritating and alienating; in some instances it arouses deep hostility. Hence every responsible effort is made to avoid offensive language. Sometimes the bias against women is built into the vernacular translations of texts but is not found in the original language. That is what happened in the case of the English translation of the Catechism of the Catholic Church where the English text is much more exclusive than the French original.

Conclusion

Liturgical law is not simply the concern of canonists. On the contrary, the legislator intends the chief audience for his laws to be the people of God who put the laws into effect in their church life. Since the liturgy is so central and fundamental to the development and nurturing of the faith and life of the

29. James A. Coriden, *An Introduction to Canon Law*, rev. ed. (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 205.

30. *Ibid.*

31. *Ibid.*

Catholic community, it is essential that the Church's discipline regulating the worship be familiar to and properly understood and implemented by the community, especially by all those entrusted with preparing for and ministering in the liturgical celebrations. Effective liturgical celebrations are the result of many factors. Even if the bishops, priests, deacons, parish liturgists, and members of liturgy committees know and understand liturgical laws, that in itself will not guarantee positive experience of worship by the community. However, it must be the starting point. Liturgical laws provide the skeletal directions from which the living liturgy is enlivened by the diverse talents, creativity, and spirituality of the local Catholic communities. The study of liturgical law is foundational, but it only achieves its final purpose in the living, Spirit-filled worship of God's people, the Church.

Adequate formation must be given to leaders of prayer and other ministers so they may serve the community of faith well. A responsible approach to liturgy and law is never fostered by an anxious, suspicious, fearful, or rigid attitude that inhibits both a true and fruitful development of Christian faith. A mature attitude is dependent on excellence in liturgical leadership, planning, and celebration of the Catholic rites. It is never fostered by untrained amateurs whose inept and haphazard efforts tend to distort the Christian mysteries and endanger the honest renewal of the Christian faith. Efforts to initiate the faithful into the meaning of the Church's liturgy must be given priority so that their participation will be enlightened and the mystery of Christ interiorized in the lives of the people. The most profound change has to be that of the heart, which takes place through the power of the Spirit who comes to us in the celebration of the liturgy as well as in other ways. Both liturgy and law must promote fullness of life in preparation for the day when the Lord will come again to make all things new.³²

32. Yves Congar, "Autorité, initiative, coresponsabilité: Elements de réflexion sur conditions dans lesquelles le problème se pose aujourd'hui dans l'Église," *La Maison-Dieu* 97 (1969): 34-57.

Theological and Pastoral Reflections

David N. Power and Catherine Vincie

This article offers a commentary on the theology of the 2002 *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (IGMR2002). On the one hand it will attend to the modifications and new emphases given in this revised text, and on the other, it will offer some critique of the theological foundations of Eucharist that predate the current version.

IGMR is primarily about the liturgical law governing the celebration of the Eucharist (cf. Seasoltz, above). The section that is mainly theological is the Preamble (see nos. 1–15 below), though theological and pastoral elements are also scattered throughout the document. It has been thirty years since IGMR1975, and it is appropriate to take a fresh look at the theology of this introduction to the Roman Missal in its new configuration, IGMR2002. While remaining substantially the same as IGMR1975, the new Instruction takes into account thirty-five years of pastoral experience with the revised Order of Mass. Accordingly, it makes certain rubrical clarifications, expands some theological explanations, gives further specificity to gestures of both clergy and people, and includes some changes in practice as well. It also corrects the previous Instruction so that the new text is consistent with other liturgical books and instructions published since 1974.

This commentary is made in the light of certain assumptions about the place of the Eucharist in the life of the Church and the worship of God. As the Church's most central of sacraments, the Eucharist expresses in an exemplary way the community's self-understanding, its core beliefs, its relationship to the divine, its understanding of salvation, and the meaning given to sacramental expression. Not only a theological source and resource, the Eucharist also aims at continually forming the faith of those participating in it, playing a dynamic role in the ongoing life of the faith community. While granting the expressive and formative nature of liturgical celebration, it is also important to attend to the specific and historically limited nature of the Eucharist at any given moment in history. The eucharistic tradition of the Church is broader and more complex than is expressed in the liturgical celebration of any given era. Thus theological reflection plays an important role in evaluating the adequacy of eucharistic practice of a particular time in light of a rich and diverse tradition.

The concern of *IGMR2002* is the celebration or performance of the Eucharist. Whatever is given in ritual books remains to be brought to life in actual celebration with the visual, the aural, and the kinesthetic dimensions adding their own surplus of meaning. Yet in a tradition like Roman Catholicism, that values the universality of its liturgical practice even while accepting a certain local diversity, official ritual texts provide a great deal of material upon which to reflect. The commentary will first take a look at the principles for the interpretation and appropriation of the Roman tradition given in the Instruction itself. Attention will then be given to its theology of celebration, its theology of the liturgy of the Word, and finally its theology of eucharistic sacrifice.

Principles of Interpretation

It is valuable to start with an overview of the hermeneutical principles that the Instruction itself sets forth for the interpretation of the Roman Rite and its appropriation in contemporary circumstances.¹ While some of these might be applied to any eucharistic liturgy, it is clear that the Instruction is specifically concerned with the Roman tradition, as it began in the Church of Rome and then spread more widely, adapted to use in other local churches. While contemporary theologies draw on various liturgical traditions, and while the texts of the revision mandated by the Second Vatican Council drew on the liturgies of other Churches, a theological commentary on the Roman Rite needs to see it in the light of this particular tradition. To some extent it has to take a distance from the larger discourse in order to see the mystery of the Eucharist within the perspectives of this one tradition. Keeping faithful to this is the task the Instruction set itself.

The first principle concerns where the latest reforms fit within the longer tradition. While affirming an “unbroken tradition” (*Traditio non intermissa*) of faith (no. 6),² the document states that this may be expressed in a variety of prayers and texts, and allows for some change over the course of time. While showing the connection between the Second Vatican Council (1962–65) and the liturgical renewal of the *Ordo Missae*, it also makes appeal to the Decrees of the Council of Trent (1545–1563) and to the Missal (*MR1570*) promulgated under Pius V (d. 1572). By doing this, it situates Trent firmly in its own special historical setting, doctrinal, theological, and liturgical. It is noted that those who took part in the Council of Trent were much better acquainted with medieval commentaries on the Mass than they were with the “holy Fathers” (*sanctorum Patrum*) of the Church. The knowledge of liturgical tradition possessed by the

1. Even in the section dealing with adaptation and inculturation (nos. 397–398 below), the document makes it clear that it is not meant to envisage the development of new liturgical families, but only development within the tradition of the Roman Liturgy.

2. Quotations from the *IGMR2002* in this commentary are paired with the English translation found in *GIRM2003*.

reformers of *MR1570* was also limited, coming mainly from *MR1474* and the Missal used in Rome in the time of Innocent III (d. 1216) (*IGMR2002*, no. 7).

Hence, in relation to Trent and *MR1570*, the reform promulgated after the Second Vatican Council could, on the one hand, respect both the doctrinal teaching of Trent and the norms and texts of the Missal and, on the other hand, make its own revisions in the light of a more ancient tradition, both doctrinal and liturgical. Some of the consequences of this are spelled out. As far as doctrine is concerned, it is noted by the Instruction that at Vatican II there was no longer the need to defend the sacrificial nature of the Mass or the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, as the Council of Trent was obliged to do. In the light of the present knowledge of earlier traditions, new insight arises today concerning what Trent itself affirmed about the commemorative or memorial character of the sacramental sacrifice.³

As far as rites and texts are concerned, the latest revision of the Missal drew more fully on the “norms of the holy Fathers” (*sanctorum Patrum norma*, no. 8) and on the “variety of prayers and rites” (*precum rituumque varietas*) that come from different liturgical traditions and from different epochs of the Roman tradition (no. 9). Indeed, even while the intention is to keep faithful to the Roman tradition, study is required of “the quite diverse human and social forms prevailing in the Semitic, Greek, and Latin areas” (*humani civilisque cultus formis tam inter se differentibus, quippe quae vigerent in regionibus semiticis, graecis, latinis*, no. 9). It is in light of this knowledge of the historical and contextual nature of the eucharistic tradition, that the work mandated by Vatican II could accommodate the pastoral principle of accommodation to the needs and orientations of the present time. This is to remain faithful to the spirit of the Council of Trent and *MR1570*, both of which had made accommodations to the needs of their own epoch. Today’s accommodations include all that aids the active participation of the assembly (since *Sacrosanctum Concilium* [SC], no. 14 articulates this as a central principle of the reform), such as the use of the vernacular, the praying aloud of the Eucharistic Prayer, and the possibility of communion under two forms.

It is much further down in the Instruction that a scriptural principle is seen to lie behind the effort to be faithful both to the patristic and early liturgical tradition, and to the current times (no. 72). This principle teaches that in every era, the celebration of the Lord’s Supper should follow the pattern of the Last Supper, as it is known from the texts of the New Testament. While this is not clearly said, what is implied is that liturgical reform and teaching look to the scriptural word as the ultimate norm, even though this is always, and has to be, appropriated and interpreted in context and by the reception of the believing community. Not only does the New Testament give the Church right belief about the Eucharist, it even gives us the pattern of the celebration to be followed. Quite naturally, the Instruction avoids the discussions of liturgical scholars about the exact pat-

3. In this respect, including an *epiclesis* as well as an *anamnesis* in new Eucharistic Prayers is consistent with the patristic and liturgical tradition of the apostolic faith.

tern or form of the Last Supper or the early Christian Eucharist or Supper,⁴ but it does ask that the Church attend to the pattern of Jesus' own action: the Word remembered, the taking of elements of bread and wine, the thanksgiving whereby the "offerings" become the Body and Blood of Christ, and communion of the gathering in the blessed and sanctified offerings. Aspects of such a reading of the NT narratives may be discussed or disputed by scriptural and liturgical authors, but what is important is the reference to the total action or ritual as key to the meaning of what was and is now done, and as key to how churches celebrate in the memory of Christ in obedience to his memorial command. This is akin to what is known in semiotics and semantics as an interpretation of the whole in reference to units, and of units in the context of the whole.

A further principle is found in *IGMR2002*'s claim that good adaptation to cultures may be done within the Roman Rite, given that the Roman Rite in the course of history "has in a deep, organic, and harmonious way incorporated into itself certain other usages derived from the customs and cultures of different peoples and of various particular Churches of both East and West, so that in this way, the Roman Rite has acquired a certain supraregional character" (*profundo, organico et harmonico modo alios quosdam in se integravit, qui e consuetudinibus et ingenio diversorum populorum variarumque Ecclesiarum particularium sive Occidentis sive Orientis derivabantur, indolem quandam supraregionalem sic acquirunt*, no. 397). How this claim to be supraregional is coupled with the process of mutual enrichment through the process of the inculturation of eucharistic liturgy is not further explained, nor the extent to which it can organically incorporate elements from Semitic, Greek, and other Latin liturgies.

Theology of Celebration

In looking at the underlying theology of *IGMR2002* and its influence on ritual prescriptions, we begin with the theology of celebration, inclusive of the notion of assembly. The authors of *SC* took great pains to stress the interrelationship between Christ, the Church, and the liturgy. Jesus Christ, anointed by the Holy Spirit, was sent by the Father to bring the saving work of God to fulfillment (*SC*, no. 5). The Church, born from his side, was sent to proclaim the paschal mystery. To accomplish this, Christ "willed that the work of salvation which [the apostles] preached, they should [also] enact through the sacrifice and sacraments around which the entire liturgical life revolves" (*SC*, no. 6). The liturgy, a work of Christ himself and the whole Church, is the means of human sanctification and of giving glory to God (*SC*, no. 7). Thus *SC* presents Christ, the Church, and the liturgy as inextricably bound together in continuing the work of salvation and of offering continual praise to God.

4. For a summary of this, see Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of the Early Liturgy*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 118–143.

IGMR2002 continues to work with this triadic relationship. The Mass is the action of Christ and the People of God (nos. 16, 27, 35, 91). The eucharistic liturgy pertains to the whole Body of the Church, manifests it and has its effect upon it (no. 91). The meaning of the Eucharistic Prayer is that the entire congregation should join itself with Christ in confessing the great deeds of God and in the offering of sacrifice (no. 78). Christ, Church, and liturgy continue to be intertwined as the Church lives out its mandate to keep memorial of the crucified and risen One.

If there is one change in the Christ/Church/liturgy triad, it is the more deliberate inclusion of the role of the Holy Spirit in *IGMR2002* than we see in *SC* or in previous versions of *IGMR*. The priest and the assembly together offer the sacrifice through Christ *in the Holy Spirit* to God the Father (*IGMR2002*, nos. 16, 78, 93, emphasis added). The Holy Spirit aids in the appropriation of the Word (no. 56). The epiclesis is deliberately described as the power of the Holy Spirit, for it is especially by the Holy Spirit that the Church's prayer is efficacious (no. 79c). Although one might have hoped for even greater elaboration on the role of the Holy Spirit, these are not insignificant inclusions in that they provide a key marker of the gradual recovery of the Holy Spirit in the Latin West in both prayer and theology.

IGMR2002 stands in continuity with *SC* in another important respect: the liturgy is an *action* and one accomplished by the *whole gathered community*. In regard to the practice of centuries when the action of the liturgy was confined to the clergy, the Second Vatican Council recovered the vision whereby the liturgies of the Church are seen as the action of the entire congregation, "the holy people united and organized under their bishops" (*SC*, no. 26). Since that time our liturgical books, beginning with *Ordo Missae* of Paul VI in 1969, have been so revised as to make that statement a reality.

IGMR2002 continues to emphasize this point. It begins the very first chapter with the statement that "The celebration of Mass, as the *action* of Christ and the *People of God*. . ." (*Celebratio Missae, ut actio Christi et populi Dei*) is the center of Christian life (no. 16, emphasis added). The full expression of the local Church is the Sunday celebration of the Eucharist with its full complement of ministers inclusive of the bishop actively taking part (nos. 112 and 113). *IGMR2002* insists that the Mass has by its nature a communitarian character (no. 34). Acclamations and responses are important "so that the action of the entire community may be clearly expressed and fostered" (*ut actio totius communitatis clare exprimat et foveatur*, no. 35). While the hierarchical nature of the assembly is also a foundational element of *IGMR2002*, it retains the emphasis on the nature of the Eucharist as an action of the whole People of God.

This has practical results in the emphasis placed on singing and on moments of silence. While previous *IGMRs* had noted this, *IGMR2002* is even more insistent on the integral place of singing in the celebration of the Eucharist (nos. 41, 61, 62, 393). Of particular interest is a new paragraph on the Alleluia before

the gospel, describing it as something which “constitutes in itself a rite or act, by which the assembly of the faithful praises and welcomes and greets the Lord who is about to speak to them in the Gospel and professes its faith in liturgical song” (*ritum seu actum per se stantem constituit, quo fidelium coetus Dominum sibi in Eoangelio locuturum excipit atque salutatur fidemque suam cantu profitetur*, no. 62). Fresh attention is given to the singing of the appropriate elements in the Eucharistic Prayer as the association of the faithful with the prayer of the priest (no. 147). It is also noted that the communion song is meant to highlight the communitarian character of the communion procession (no. 86).

Alongside song, silence is highlighted as a mode of participation of all in the liturgy. It is presented as an appropriate way to grasp the Word of God (no. 56). Repeating what previous editions said of the importance of silence in the penitential rite, after the homily, and after communion, this edition adds a new paragraph commending silence throughout the whole building in preparation for the celebration of the Mass (no. 45).

The Liturgical Assembly

In light of these principles for active participation in eucharistic celebration, one can consider how *IGMR2002* envisages the liturgical assembly as such. In the decade before the Council, French-speaking scholars made significant efforts to retrieve the theological importance of the gathered assembly. In the minds of authors such as Thierry Maertens and Aimé-George Martimort, it was important to retrieve the biblical notion of the assembly to reclaim the communal nature of the Christian assembly and the corporate dimension of its work.⁵ The Christian assembly is the new People of God gathered around Christ and sent to continue his mission and ministry. The assembly, presided over by the priest or bishop, together offers the sacrifice and is the active subject of the liturgical action.

SC made some strides in incorporating this material, but it did so only obliquely. The gathered assembly was not explicitly named as much as the generic word “Church” or the term “mystical Body” was used. At times it was difficult to know if the Church in general was meant as the subject of the liturgical action or the gathered assembly. In the years after the Council, Church documents became much clearer in this regard.

5. See Aimé-George Martimort, *The Church at Prayer*, vol. 1 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, revised edition, 1984); idem, “L’assemblée liturgique,” *La Maison-Dieu* 20 (1949): 153–175; idem, “L’assemblée liturgique, mystère du Christ,” *La Maison-Dieu* 40 (1954): 5–29; idem, “Dimanche, assemblée et paroisse,” *La Maison-Dieu* 57 (1959): 55–84; idem, “Précisions sur l’assemblée,” *La Maison-Dieu* 60 (1959): 7–34; Thierry Maertens, *Assembly for Christ: From Biblical Theology to Pastoral Theology in the Twentieth Century* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970); idem, “L’assemblée festive du Dimanche,” *Assemblée du Seigneur* 1 (1962): 28–42; idem, *L’Assemblée chrétienne* (Bruges: Biblica, 1964).

IGMR2002 is one of those documents that attend more carefully to the Church here and now gathered. All IGMRs note that the people of God called together to celebrate the Lord's memorial are a "local gathering together of the Church" (*sanctae Ecclesiae coadunatione locali*, IGMR1975, no. 7; IGMR2002, no. 27). It is most obvious in the reworking of SC's paragraph on the multiple modes of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. In SC we read that "[Christ] is present when the Church prays and sings" (no. 7). In IGMRs we read that "Christ is really present in the very liturgical assembly gathered in his name. . . ." (*Christus realiter praesens adest in ipso coetu in suo nomine congregato*, IGMR1975, no. 7; IGMR2002, no. 27). Other places continue this care to specify the Church here gathered in liturgical assembly. The priest exercises his office "over the gathered assembly" (*coetus congregati fungentem*, IGMR1975, no. 11; IGMR2002, no. 31), and the priest presides over the faithful people here and now gathered (IGMR1975, no. 60; IGMR2002, no. 93).

This emphasis on the gathered assembly and the insistence of Christ's presence in the assembly accomplishes several things. It focuses our attention on the assembly inclusive of its presider as a subject of the liturgical action. This realization paved the way for the Second Vatican Council to declare that "full, conscious, and active" participation is "demanded by the very nature of the liturgy" and is the assembly's right and duty by virtue of their baptism (SC, no. 14). Overturning centuries of passivity, the Council challenged the gathered Church to take full responsibility for the unfolding of the liturgy according to their proper roles. IGMR2002 states that it is of the greatest importance that the celebration of the Mass be "so arranged that the sacred ministers and the faithful taking part in it" (*ita ordinetur, ut sacri ministri atque fideles . . . participantes*) might benefit more fittingly from it as was intended (no. 17). Reiterating what is said in SC (no. 14), IGMR2002 insists "with due regard for the nature and the particular circumstances of each liturgical assembly" (*attentis natura aliisque adiunctis uniuscuiusque coetus liturgici*), the entire celebration is planned so that the full, conscious, and active participation may be promoted (no. 18). That participation is specified according to a distinction of roles, but all, whether ordained or lay, in fulfilling their office or their duty should carry out solely but completely that which pertains to them (no. 91). Rather than seeing this sentence as limiting participation of the assembly, this statement may be understood as a corrective to pre-Conciliar practice when the ordained minister duplicated what every other minister said. Now the distribution of roles without redundancy, inclusive of the assembly, is to prevail.

Perhaps the clearest expression of the unity of the gathered Body is given in that section devoted to the "Duties of the People of God" (*De Muneribus Populi Dei*). Here the assembly is invited to shun all appearances of individualism or division and to keep their unity in the forefront. IGMR2002, no. 96 reads that "Indeed, [the assembly] form[s] one body, whether by hearing the word of God, or by joining in the prayers and the singing, or above all by the common offering of Sacrifice and by a common partaking at the Lord's table" (*Unum autem*

corpus efficiant sive verbum Dei audiendo, sive in orationibus et in cantu partem habendo, sive praesertim in communi oblatione sacrificii et in communi participatione mensae Domini).

The presentation of the active and conscious participation of all the baptized is not without a certain ambiguity in this document, however. There is a tendency in *IGMR2002* to treat it primarily in terms of the assembly's inner meditation on the Word (see nos. 56 and 61 below) or their inner consent to what the priest does in the liturgy of the Eucharist. While this configuration to Christ in mind and body is most basic and is the core of all good participation, there is a growing body of literature on active participation that helps to bring out the point that an externally manifested participation belongs to the sacramental structures of the celebration of the mystery of redemption in the Eucharist.⁶

To say that the liturgical assembly forms one body and is the subject of liturgy is not to say that there are no distinctions within it. All *IGMRs* have been firm in stating that the assembly is hierarchically ordered (*IGMR2002*, no. 16). The priest presides over the assembly and acts *in persona Christi* (nos. 27, 31, 33, 93). He also prays in the name of the Church and of the assembly community (no. 33). Other ministers such as deacons, acolytes, lectors, the schola and the assembly also have their distinct roles to play and offer true liturgical service (nos. 98–107).

IGMR2002 goes further than its predecessor in noting the distinction of roles within the liturgical assembly. It takes particular care to emphasize which actions are to be done by the ordained and not by the laity. One can assume that these new additions to *IGMR2002* were put in place to counter what had become common practice in many local churches and are meant to sharpen the distinction between the ordained and the lay. Some additions are only phrases inserted in paragraphs that stand substantially the same. For example, in the section on a eucharistic service without the presence and participation of the faithful, the phrase the priest "fulfills his own principal office" (*munus suum praecipuum adimplet*, no. 19) is added. In an entirely new section on the homily it is stated that the priest presider may entrust the homily to a concelebrating priest or to a deacon, but he may never entrust it to a lay person (no. 66). The fraction rite is described as a rite "reserved to the priest and deacon" (*sacerdoti et diacono reservatur*, no. 83), while the Eucharistic Prayer is reserved to the priest "by virtue of his ordination" (*vi ordinationis*, no. 147). In a new paragraph the laity are instructed not to approach the altar before the priest has received communion, and extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist should always wait for the priest to give them the vessels for distribution to the faithful (no. 162).

While distinctions within the community are made clear, one could have hoped for a more integrated treatment of the ministerial priesthood and the royal priesthood of all believers particularly regarding who offers the sacrifice.

6. See J. Lamberts, *The Active Participation Revisited. La participation active 100 ans après Pie X et 40 ans après Vatican II. Textes et Études liturgiques. Studies in Liturgy XX* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004); *La Maison-Dieu* 241 (2005/1), *La participation active*.

It is only by placing the role of all ministries and actions within a theology of Church as Body of Christ, People of God, and royal priesthood, that we can have a proper perspective of the Mass. It is the congregation, in its diversity of actions, role, and ministries, which embodies the mystery of salvation. It is in assembly, Word, sacrifice, and sacrament that the Church itself is the sacrament of the renewal of the mysteries of redemption, through which in Christ's name and the power of the Spirit, it renders true worship to the Father and is itself shown to be the Sacrament of reconciliation of humanity with God.

The reference in the Preamble to the preface for the Chrism Mass of Holy Thursday (no. 4) could have been used more fully. Within the one royal priesthood, says the preface, some are chosen for ministry through the laying-on of hands. It then lists the services exercised by this ministry, which include guidance of the community, preaching of the Word, and the celebration of the sacraments. This is a comprehensive vision of ministerial priesthood that echoes the documents of the Second Vatican Council and, in fact, brings us back to some patristic sources quite important to the understanding of the Roman liturgy.

To quote one of the most authoritative sources on the Roman tradition, Leo the Great (d. 461), in his sermons on the Passion, points to the one unique mediation and sacrifice of Christ, on which the existence of the priestly and kingly people of the Church is founded. Of this the Eucharist is the visible sacrament: "Lord, . . . you drew all things to yourself so that the devotion of all peoples everywhere might celebrate, in a sacrament made perfect and visible, what was carried out in the one temple of Judea under obscure foreshadowings."⁷ This would allow the priestly service of the bishop and the kingly devotion and priesthood of the people to be seen in a more integrated way than is achieved in *IGMR2002*. Leo does not enunciate the distinction between the ministerial priesthood and the royal priesthood of the faithful that we find in *IGMR2002*, but speaks of the ordering of the one royal priesthood and of the service of the bishop within it. Seeing the Eucharist as the sacrament and the sacrifice of the one royal priesthood that shares in the one sacrifice, the one priesthood and the one kingship of Christ that the sacrament commemorates, is the principle on which eucharistic theology is founded in the Roman tradition. This is in keeping with what is found in the holy fathers cited by *IGMR2002* (no. 8), namely Irenaeus (d. ca. 200), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 387), Ambrose (d. 397) and John Chrysostom (d. 407).

This said, with relief one can note that *IGMR2002* modifies *IGMR1975* not only by adding new material but by eliminating offensive material as well. *IGMR1975* contains a section that detailed the participation of women, saying that their ministries must be exercised outside the sanctuary at the discretion

7. On the one priesthood of Christ in which all Christians share by participation in its blessings and its offering, see *Sermo* 8.6–8 on the Passion (*PL* 54:340–342). Although the term is not frequently employed, the image of the Church as Body of Christ exists in the sermons of Leo alongside that of royal priesthood.

of the rector, while participation of women at the altar itself was completely denied (no. 70). The US adaptation of *IGMR1975* did not limit their participation to outside the sanctuary area, either as readers, cantors, musicians, etc.; however the participation of women at the altar continued to be denied until 1994. *IGMR2002* must be complimented on having left behind any gender-specific ministries except that of the ordained presider (e.g., no. 107).

Liturgy and Theology of the Word

SC recognizes the presence of Christ to the Church through the proclamation of the Scriptures (no. 7). The section of *IGMR2002* on the Liturgy of the Word (nos. 55–71) brings out the meditative, active, and participatory aspects of this part of the Mass. As the Second Vatican Council said, Word and Eucharist belong together in constituting the celebration of Christ's mysteries. Together they belong in the Church as expression and manifestation of what it is for the Church to live and celebrate the mystery of salvation, centered on Christ.

This is not simply giving attention to the Word of God in the Sacred Scriptures, but attending to an act of the Church, the Word presented and received within the faith of the Church as it relates the Scriptures to the mystery of Christ. It is for this reason that the Gospel is the "high point." In faith and in celebration of the Paschal Mystery, the Church reads the rest of the Scriptures in relation to Christ, as the Risen Christ himself did when he encountered the two disciples on the road to Emmaus. While the Church reads the Scriptures in different ways in different settings, in the liturgy they are heard in the context of faith proclaimed in the creed and ritualized in the solemnity attached to the proclamation of the gospel. Since the Liturgy of the Word is an act of the assembly, an act of Church, and an expression of the faith of the royal priesthood, it is good that *IGMR2002* underlines the active and conscious elements of the participation of all, not only by listening but also by silence and by song, and by the participation of readers who belong to the body of the baptized.

In presenting the role of the homily (nos. 65, 66) the Instruction attends most of all to its didactic or instructional character (see no. 28 below), and the need to relate the texts to the liturgical year and its feasts. This is indeed something that is indicated in the didactic principles of SC. Readers and interpreters of the Instruction will also be mindful of the place of the homily in bringing about what liturgical theology speaks of as the "actualization" of God's Word. This is to say that in its celebration of the mystery of Christ and Church, the homilist also guides the people of God as they learn to see how the mystery unfolded in the scriptures is brought to reality in the particular circumstances of their own lives and place in history. So will they continue to discover how, in the Holy Spirit, the Lord continues to be present to the Church in the Word.

IGMR2002 makes some mention of the role of the Spirit in the meditation of the Scriptures (no. 56), but it could have said more on the place of the Spirit in the Liturgy of the Word, since the Spirit is active there as well as in the Liturgy

of the Eucharist. To see more fully the role of the Spirit in the Liturgy of the Word, one may refer to the *praenotanda* of the *Ordo Lectionum (OLM1981-Pr)* where mention is made several times of the action of the Spirit in the Liturgy of the Word.⁸

In *OLM1981-Pr* the role of the Spirit in the hearts of the faithful as they individually meditate the Scriptures is indeed mentioned (nos. 3, 9, 28). It goes forward, however, in recalling that the assembly gathers in the Spirit to hear the Word (no. 7) and that it is in the power of the Spirit that the Word is proclaimed and received in faith. *OLM1981-Pr* also relates the work of the Spirit in the Liturgy of the Word to the work of the Spirit in the economy of revelation and salvation. First it refers to the Sacred Scriptures as works inspired by the Spirit (no. 2). Then it recalls that, when read in the assembly, the proclamation of the work of salvation becomes a living and effective Word through the power of the Spirit (no. 4) and relates the response of the Church to the Amen pronounced by Christ when, as he shed his blood to seal God's covenant, he did so in the Holy Spirit (no. 6). Christ and Church are thus bound together in their response to God's initiative and grace through the Holy Spirit. Finally, it says that it is the Spirit who endows the Church with a diversity of gifts, for the building up of the Church in faith in God's Word (nos. 9 and 12).

To this relation between Word and Spirit affecting the Liturgy of the Word, one could add some further points. We know how throughout liturgical history, churches have made their selection of passages in faith, but the faith is what is bestowed when heeding the Spirit and reading the Scriptures in the light given by the Spirit. This is also the eschatological Spirit which is at work, and in this we know that all hearing of the Scripture, all appropriation of the Word of God, is done in anticipation of the Lord's coming, just as communion in his Body and Blood is a proclamation of the Lord's death, "until he comes." In this proclamation and expectation, there is in the power of the Spirit an even more intimate link between the Liturgy of the Word and the Liturgy of the Eucharist in the celebration of the Mass.

Theology and Liturgy of Eucharistic Sacrifice

In its Preamble, *IGMR2002* presents a theology of eucharistic sacrifice as fundamental to traditional Catholic understanding and celebration of the Mass. This needs some examination and discussion. The Preamble was added by Paul VI (d. 1978) to address some of the complaints that the new Order of Mass was not in continuity with tradition. It speaks insistently of the sacrificial nature of the Mass. It quotes selectively from *SC*, no. 47, stressing that "At the Last Supper our Savior instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice of his Body and Blood, by which he would perpetuate the Sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries. . ." (*Salvator noster*

8. *OLM1981-Pr*, nos. 3, 6, 7, 9, 12 and 28.

in *Cena novissima sacrificium eucharisticum Corporis et Sanguinis sui instituit, quo sacrificium crucis in saecula*, IGMR2002, no. 2). Referencing the *Veronense* the text further states, "As often as the commemoration of this sacrifice is celebrated, the work of our redemption is carried out" (*quoties huius hostiae commemoratio celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur*, no. 2). And again, the priest in the name of the whole people renders God thanks and offers the living and holy Sacrifice. Instituted at the Last Supper, the Mass is the sacramental renewal of the sacrifice of the cross, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, of propitiation and satisfaction (no. 2). The ministerial priesthood and the royal priesthood of believers unite their spiritual sacrifice with the sacrifice of Christ and together give thanks for the mystery of salvation in Christ through the eucharistic sacrifice (no. 5).

The Eucharist is to be understood as a "commemorative sacrifice"; it is a memorial of Christ's death and resurrection, a sacrifice acceptable to the Father and salvific for the whole world (nos. 2 and 17). *IGMR2002* speaks further of memorial, stating that in the Mass the mysteries of redemption are recalled "so as in some way to be made present" (*ut quodammodo praesentia reddantur*, no. 16). Because of this the Eucharist serves as the high point of God's work to sanctify the world and of humanity's efforts to offer worship to God (no. 16).

What is surprising is the lack of stress on Eucharist as the expression and source of the communion of the Church, although there are some places that pick up this theme. One reference we do find to Eucharist as communion is in the section of the Eucharistic Prayer on the offering. There the assembly is invited to offer themselves to the Father so that through Christ the Mediator they may be united with God and with each other (no. 79f). While this sentence footnotes *Eucharisticum Mysterium* (no. 12), which is a passing reference to eucharistic communion, it ignores the extended section on the Eucharistic Mystery and the Unity of Christians in no. 8 of that document and a more limited section on communion with the local and universal church and even of all humanity in *Eucharisticum Mysterium*, no. 18. A second reference to communion in *IGMR2002* is made in the description of the fraction rite which states that "the many faithful are made one body (1 Cor 10:17) by receiving Communion from the one Bread of Life which is Christ" (*significat fideles multos in Communionem ex uno pane vitae, qui est Christus . . . unum corpus effici*, no. 83, see also nos. 5 and 321), but there is no elaboration upon it.

IGMR2002 presents its theological understanding of the Eucharist starting in nos. 2 and 72. In no. 2 of the Preamble, *IGMR2002* quotes only what is said of the institution of the memorial sacrifice and omits the rest of SC, no. 47. On the other hand, no. 72 is more complete: "At the Last Supper Christ instituted the Paschal Sacrifice and banquet by which the Sacrifice of the Cross is continuously made present in the Church whenever the priest, representing Christ the Lord, carries out what the Lord himself did and handed over to his disciples to be done in his memory" (*In Cena novissima, Christus sacrificium et convivium paschale instituit, quo sacrificium crucis in Ecclesia continue praesens*

efficitur, cum sacerdos, Christum Dominum repraesentans, idem perficit quod ipse Dominus egit atque discipulis in sui memoriam faciendum tradidit). This paragraph balances the Preamble's emphasis on the Mass as sacrifice by stating that the Mass is both Paschal Sacrifice and *banquet*. This addition of banquet imagery is suggestive of the eschatological banquet of the Lamb and at the same time places greater emphasis on the meal nature of the Eucharist (see no. 281). *IGMR2002* goes further than its predecessors in making normative the communion of both bread and cup first by repeating that Holy Communion has a fuller form as a sign when it is distributed under both kinds (no. 282), and then by making small but significant changes in phrases and in ritual action. In describing the Fraction Rite, *IGMR2002* spells out in a fuller way the reception from bread and cup. "The faithful, though they are many, receive from the one bread the Lord's Body and from the one chalice the Lord's Blood. . . ." (*fideles, quamvis multi, ex uno pane accipiunt Corpus et ex uno calice Sanguinem Domini*, no. 72.3). Following the Lamb of God, the priest is now allowed to raise the host "above the chalice" (*super calicem*), showing more clearly the unity of the body and blood of the Lord (nos. 84 and 157). The number of occasions when communion under both forms may be received is significantly broadened (nos. 281–287). Several occasions are listed when it is expected, and then it is up to the discretion of bishop and priests to decide when it is pastorally more suitable.

The Eucharistic Prayer is introduced as the center and summit of the Mass and is described as that great prayer of thanksgiving and sanctification (no. 78). Whereas for a long time almost all attention was given to the institution narrative and its consecratory effect, current scholarship has spent enormous energy in considering the history and meaning of the whole Eucharistic Prayer as a unit and the function of the institution narrative within this great prayer.⁹ The addition of nine other Eucharistic Prayers to the traditional Roman Canon has likewise broadened the discussion of what constitutes eucharistic praying.

Reiterating *IGMR1975* (no. 54), *IGMR2002* states that the meaning of the prayer is that the entire congregation "should join itself to Christ in confessing the great deeds of God and in the offering of Sacrifice" (*se cum Christo coniungat in confessione magnalium Dei et in oblatione sacrificii*, no. 78). It then briefly explains each part of the Eucharistic Prayer. The *thanksgiving* expresses thanksgiving for all the works of salvation, the *acclamation* is a joining with heavenly powers, the *epiclesis* is where the church implores the power of the Holy Spirit to consecrate the gifts and transform the community. The *institution narrative and consecration* is explained as the means by which the Sacrifice is carried out, while the *anamnesis* is where the Church keeps memorial of the Paschal Mystery.

9. On the parts of the prayer and the pertinent literature, see David N. Power, "A Prayer of Intersecting Parts: Elements of the Eucharistic Prayer," *Liturgical Ministry* 14 (Summer 2005): 120–131; also no. 43 below.

The *offering* is where the church offers in the Holy Spirit the spotless victim to the Father, and the *intercessions* plead for the whole church, living and dead, for the redemption purchased by Christ's Body and Blood. The *doxology* is the final act of glorification of God and concludes with the people's Amen (no. 79a-h). What is of special significance is the giving of consecratory power to the epiclesis, aligning the Latin West more closely with the Eastern Churches than it has been in a millennium.

Priest and Faithful

A problem with the Instruction's theology of sacrifice lies in the way in which it distinguishes between the role of the ordained priest and the role of the congregation of the faithful. In the didactic part of the document, *IGMR2002* puts the doctrinal focus on the nature of the Eucharist as sacramental and memorial sacrifice. The basic principle is enunciated in no. 2 of the Instruction, quoting the prayer over the offerings of the Mass of Holy Thursday: "as often as commemoration is kept of Christ's sacrifice, our redemption is renewed" (*quoties huius hostiae commemoratio celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur*). In line with theological and liturgical history, this makes it quite clear that the Eucharist may be called a sacrifice inasmuch as it is memorial and sacramental. The Instruction, however, immediately goes on to locate this offering in the Eucharistic Prayer as proclaimed by the ordained priest, who in performing the commemoration prays in the name of the whole people, offering the Church's offering. Later, in treating of the Eucharistic Prayer in its various parts (no. 79), *IGMR2002* locates the renewal of sacrifice in the words and actions of Christ himself in the institution narrative, now repeated by the priest, and the offering of this sacrifice in what follows in the Eucharistic Prayer. In reference to the epiclesis, the role of the Spirit in the consecration through the words of Jesus, and the role of the Spirit in the offering by the Church, is acknowledged (no. 79c).

It is repeated several times (nos. 2, 5, 16) that the eucharistic action and eucharistic offering is the work of the whole Church. This, however, is said to be achieved in virtue of its hierarchical ordering (no. 16) and depends on the exercise of the ministerial priesthood. The inclusion of the people in the sacrifice is treated in nos. 5 and 79: their role is to offer their spiritual sacrifice, to offer not only Christ but also themselves. This is their exercise of their royal priesthood, as distinct from the ministerial priesthood. The document makes a clear distinction therefore between the royal priesthood of the people and the ministerial priesthood of the ordained. Indeed, it claims that the former can be exercised only in virtue of the latter. Even more, the priesthood of the laity is fully comprehensible only by being related to the latter (no. 5).

Within the Roman tradition, Leo the Great certainly underlines the spiritual action of priesthood and kingship within the Body of Christ, but there is a better integration of the spiritual and the sacramental in the corpus of his sermons. Within Leo's vision of the work of redemption as mystery and sacrament, the

visible and bodily are intertwined with the invisible and spiritual.¹⁰ An offering that is *rationabilis*, as it is called by him and indeed later in the Roman Canon, is one made according to the Spirit, but it is both external and internal, or in other words truly sacramental. The liturgical roles of the bishop and the people differ, but together, acting as one, they constitute the mystery and sacrament of Christ's redemptive action and true sacrifice. It is through liturgy, externally expressed devotion, e.g., by the gifts brought, participation in liturgy, or Lenten penance, and through following the *exemplum* of Christ himself, that all may share in the offering of the one true *hostia*, which was offered not on the altar of the temple but on the altar of the world.¹¹

The Roman Tradition: the Appeal to Doctrine

Fundamentally, the position taken by *IGMR2002* on the nature of eucharistic sacrifice dictates its positions on other matters. This affects the theology of eucharistic communion and the communion of all participants, the theology of assembly that underlies what is said of the Eucharist as manifestation of the Church and of active and conscious participation, and the theology of the Word that underlies what is said of the Liturgy of the Word. We need then to consider how true to the Roman liturgical and doctrinal tradition is *IGMR's* theology of eucharistic sacrifice, which is given in the Preamble as the most fundamental theological principle for the celebration of the eucharistic liturgy.

In presenting its position, the current Roman Instruction refers to the doctrinal authority of both the Council of Trent and the Second Vatican Council. Leaving aside momentarily the claim to organic growth in liturgical celebration, one may ask whether in relation to these two magisterial sources the document represents an organic growth in doctrine. The difficulty is that the appeal to these past formulations of doctrine is incomplete.

Council of Trent

In citing Trent, the Instruction is not faithful to its own principle of seeing Trent in its context, when treatment of the sacrament, treatment of sacrifice and treatment of communion under one or two kinds were divided into three separate decrees, some years apart and each addressing some very specific controverted issues. In the course of these decrees, Trent actually uses the language of institution more than once to state what Christ did. The Decree on the Sacrament says clearly that in instituting it, Christ wished his Church in its consumption (*in sumptione*) to cultivate or cherish (*colere*) his memory and to proclaim

10. On Leo and the liturgy, see M. de Soos, *Le mystère liturgique d'après saint Léon le Grand* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1958).

11. . . . *nova hostia, novo imponeretur altari, et crux Christi non templi esset ara, sed mundi*. Sermon VIII on the Passion, no. 5 in *Léon le Grand, Sermons*, 2nd ed., ed. René Dolle, Sources Chrétiennes 74 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1961), 112.

his death, here quoting 1 Corinthians 11:26.¹² That is to see the rite of communion as a sacramentally commemorative act. Alongside the Tridentine statement that Christ left the eucharistic sacrifice to his Church, to be offered by priests, to represent and commemorate his own sacrifice,¹³ we have the assertion that this death is remembered and proclaimed in sacramental communion. This is not mentioned by *IGMR2002*.

As the Instruction says, the Church needs to place Trent and our dependence upon it in a larger historical context. The teachings of Trent, as well as the liturgical practices or texts that these teachings sanctioned, have to be seen in the light of the holy fathers and liturgical traditions. If in present theology and liturgy we are to refer back to Trent, a more complete and accurate treatment is surely required than is given by the Instruction. Trent, given the difference in time and concern, did not itself coordinate these statements into a harmonious doctrine, but doctrine and theology cannot eliminate the problem by preferring one set of conciliar statements and passing over others in silence.¹⁴

Sacrifice: The Liturgical Tradition

The initial description of the Eucharist as a sacrifice is accompanied in *IGMR2002* by a reference (no. 2) to the prayer over the gifts in the Mass of the Lord's Supper on Holy Thursday, a prayer whose origins can be traced back to *Veronense*. The Missal has in fact changed the original text, but that had indeed already been done in other sacramentaries and *MR1570*. The prayer from the present Liturgy of Holy Thursday mentioned in the Instruction and which is based on *Veronense* reads: *quoties hostiae commemoratio celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur* ("as often as the commemoration of this sacrifice is celebrated, the work of our redemption is carried out").

The text given in *IGMR2002*, no. 2, dates to *MR1570*. In the old Roman Sacramentary it reads: *Da nobis haec, quaesumus, domine, frequentata mysteria: quia quotiens hostiae tibi placatae commemoratio celebrantur, opus nostrae redemptionis exeritur* (no. 93).¹⁵ This is a prayer for the offerings of the gifts of the faithful. While the first part of the prayer asks that we may always be given the grace of frequenting the mysteries celebrated, the second and pertinent part could

12. Session 13, ch. 2, in Tanner, 2:693.

13. Session 22, chs. 1–2 in Tanner, 2:733–34.

14. In this regard, it is of no little interest to note how the various elements and images of the Eucharist are presented in the letter inviting the Church to the observance of a special eucharistic year, *Mane nobiscum* (2004). In no. 15 of this letter, John Paul II draws attention to the most obvious sacramental sign, that of eucharistic meal, eating and drinking the Body and Blood of Christ. He points out that the important and irreplaceable theologies of sacrifice and presence need to be related to this sign, and that it is also in this sign that we can ground the Eucharist's eschatological orientation.

15. The text is given as in the critical edition, complete with what look to us as grammatical errors.

be translated: "as often as the commemoration of the victim/offering pleasing to you is celebrated, the work of our redemption is carried out."

It is significant that the reference in the Instruction seems to assume that there is but one meaning to the word *hostia*, so that it avoids the complex usage of this and other cultic terms in the original forms of the Roman liturgy. The use of the word *hostia* in Christian Latin is rooted in the Latin translation of Ephesians 5:2, though in patristic writings it is not very broadly used. The liturgy, however, has appropriated several cultic uses of the term found in a wider Latin cultic literature.

One must then ask what meaning and significance is given to the word *hostia* in this early collection of Roman prayers known as *Veronense*.¹⁶ Given the historical affinities between the Roman liturgy and that of Alexandria, it is not surprising to see that in Roman sources, the most prominent use of *hostia*, usually in the plural, is when it is used of the sacrifice of praise (*hostiae laudis*), which is offered in memorial of Christ and all God's wonderful deeds.¹⁷ Indeed it is a well-regarded hypothesis that the language of sacrifice was introduced into the Roman Liturgy in reference to this, and under the influence of the Christian reading of Malachi 1:11.¹⁸ To grasp fully the significance of this commemorative praise, however, one has to consider the multiplicity of meanings given to *hostia* in the Roman liturgy.

In *Veronense* there are only a few places where *hostia* is directly identified with Christ himself and his offering on the cross. In two cases it is said that the mystery or commemoration of Christ's sacrifice is kept. Number 93 says that it commemorates or keeps memorial of it, while no. 92 places this commemoration in the offering of praise, from which one cannot cease in the remembrance of God's wonderful acts. Number 253 is more complex, saying that the Church in its service brings forth (*deferimus*) this spiritual victim, which in this wonderful and ineffable mystery is both immolated and offered, being both the gift of those who come in devout service and the reward given by the one who recompenses.¹⁹

16. This essay focuses on the word *hostia*, given its use in the Instruction, but of course a complete study would have to look to the rest of the vocabulary of gift and offering found in liturgical Latin.

17. See the index to the *Sacramentarium Veronense*, ed. Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta*, 2nd ed. (Rome: Herder, 1966), s.v. *hostia*; for other sacramentaries see the verbal concordance published by Jean Deshusses. Jean Deshusses-Benoit Darragon, *Concordances et tableaux pour l'étude des grands sacramentaires*, 6 vols., Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia, 9–14 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1983) 3.2:268–72.

18. Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. Ronald A. Lane (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1995), 191–193.

19. *Remotis obumbrationibus carnalium victimarum spiritalem tibi, summe pater, hostiam supplici servitute deferimus, quae miro ineffabilique mysterio et immolater semper et eadem semper offertur, pariterque et devotorum munus et remunerantis est praemium.*

There is an unusual reference to the gifts as the body and blood of Christ in *Veronense*, no. 1246. This is a prayer for the offering of gifts and so occurs before the memorial prayer. The text identifies the gift (*munus*) of the people with the body and blood of Christ, but this is clearly in the sense that they are types, figures, or symbols of them, since the elements have not yet been blessed.²⁰ In other words, the prayer gives a sacramental meaning to the action of the people in making gifts, which relates it to the commemoration of Christ's own offering. This is not unlike what we find in the elements of the Canon found in both Ambrose of Milan and the Mozarabic *Liber Ordinum*. Ambrose refers to the oblations of the people as the figure (*figura*) of the body and blood of Christ,²¹ while the Mozarabic book calls them the *imago* or image.²²

Beyond the designation of praise as *hostia* and the direct reference to Christ as *hostia*, one has to be alert to the other interlocked meanings given to *hostia* in the context of the Roman Mass, which can be verified by looking at other prefaces and offertory prayers in *Veronense*. There we see that it includes the gifts offered by the faithful, their praise and their devout prayers (e.g., nos. 21, 29, 38, 72, 131, 142, 201, 202). In the act of commemoration, it is the entire complex of offerings, including those offered by the faithful who render their service to God, which is pleasing to God. These are easily verified in *Veronense* and indeed remain scattered throughout *MR1975*.²³ The action of the people, their prayers and devotion, and the Eucharistic Prayer offered with and for them by the bishop/priest, all together constitute the sacramental memorial of Christ's offering, whereby God is pleased and placated.

In the Roman Canon, for which we have evidence in the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum* (*Gelasianum*), the multiple references of the term *hostia* are retained. The various meanings of *hostia* come together in the *Unde et memores* or anamnesis. After the recital of the supper narrative and memorial command, the Church offers the pure, holy, and immaculate sacrifice (*hostia*) and then in the following prayer appeals to the memory of the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedech, which God saw fit to accept. The meaning of this anamnesis is elucidated in a preface for Christmas found in *Veronense*²⁴ and included in *Gelasianum*. The Church unceasingly immolates the sacrifice of praise (*tuae*

20. An English translation of the prayer: "Look kindly, O Lord, on the gift of your people, by which it is not some alien fire that is placed on the altar, nor is it the blood shed of senseless animals, but by the working of the Holy Spirit it is already the body and blood of our priest (*pontifex*) himself."

21. *Ambroise de Milan, Des sacrements. Des mystères*, ed. Bernard Botte, Sources Chrétiennes 25bis (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1961), 108, 114–116.

22. *Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'église wisigothique et mozarabe d'Espagne du cinquième au onzième siècle*, ed. Marius Férotin, Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica 5 (Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot, 1904), 321.

23. See Winfried Haunerland, *Die Eucharistie und ihre Wirkungen im Spiegel der Euchologie des Missale Romanum* (Münster: Aschendorf, 1989), 77–84.

24. *Veronense*, no. 1250.

laudis hostiam iugiter immolantes), a sacrifice or offering prefigured in the offering of Abel, celebrated by Abraham and Melchisedech, instituted by the Lamb, prescribed by the Law, and fulfilled this day (Christmas) in the true Lamb and eternal High Priest. It is the Church's praise, which is said to be the sacrifice immolated, this however being a sacrifice in virtue of what was prefigured and is now fulfilled in Christ.

As Joseph Jungmann commented, the petition of the Canon is made in clear reference to the self-offering of Christ, which has been recalled in the Supper narrative and which is in the Eucharist commemorated and present in mystery.²⁵ It is, however, the Church which is making offering, in a way that incorporates into one its commemorative praise, the devotion of the faithful, and their gifts of bread and wine over which the prayer is prayed. In other words, the efficacious representation of the self-offering or sacrifice of Christ is made through the Church's sacramental action of a prayer of praise which takes up into itself the offerings of the people.

In short, in citing the liturgical tradition, *IGMR2002* attends to only one sense of the word, that namely of the unique sacrifice of Christ, ignoring any possible reference to other offerings. This reflects a problem with offering which is already present in the revisions of the *Ordo Missae* after the Second Vatican Council. The most obvious example of this is the replacement of Offertory Rites with what is called the preparation of gifts. The Missal, however, still has the Roman Canon and has yet to come to terms with the Roman tradition of making offerings, of talking clearly of these offerings, and yet not taking away from the once-and-for-all offering of the Paschal Victim.²⁶

Holy Spirit and Offering

In the chapter of *SC* on the Eucharist and in its short doctrinal definition of the Eucharist, the Council failed to include the action of the Holy Spirit.²⁷ On the other hand, when the commission for the renewal of the eucharistic liturgy included new prayers in the *Ordo Missae*, these incorporated a twofold epiclesis, one before and one after the Supper narrative. *IGMR2002* includes no mention of the Holy Spirit in its Preamble or doctrinal introduction on eucharistic sacrifice. When presenting the Eucharistic Prayer, it defines the function of the

25. Joseph Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, trans. Francis Brunner, 2 vols. (Westminster: Christian Classics, 1986), II: 225–231. See also Haunerland, as cited above, n. 23.

26. There seems to have been some feeling of embarrassment in ecumenical dialogue over this profusion of offerings, but rather than suppress them we have to be attentive to their sacramental significance, within the commemoration of the Lord's Supper and Sacrifice.

27. For a discussion of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist, with particular reference to offering, see John McKenna, *Eucharist and the Holy Spirit* (London: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975); idem, "The Epiclesis Revisited: A Look at Modern Eucharistic Prayers," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 99 (1985): 313–36; Edward Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daley (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1998); Patrick Regan, "Quenching the Spirit: The Epiclesis in Recent Roman Documents," *Worship* 79 (2005): 386–404.

invocation of the Spirit, saying that this invocation implores that by the power of the Spirit the gifts offered by human hands may be consecrated, and that the spotless Victim may be received in communion unto salvation (no. 79c).

The revised Order of Mass was intended to overcome the shortcoming of the Roman liturgical tradition, and particularly of the Canon, in its failure to include the invocation of the Spirit. How this may be done harmoniously needs examination. The Instruction's description of the epiclesis touches on this point and on its own emphasis on sacrifice when it mentions the invocation over the gifts offered by human hands. To pursue the matter further, however, we may find a point of departure in the affinity between the Alexandrian Liturgy of Mark and the Roman Canon.²⁸

The liturgy of Alexandria, like that of Rome, includes much of the rich language of offering, inclusive of the gifts, the devotion of the people, and the sacrifice of praise, and it has the same mention of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedech. It has, however, been influenced by Eastern traditions in its inclusion, at two moments of the prayer, of an invocation of the Spirit. This in fact harmonizes well with the imagery of sacrifice and offering and may be taken as an example for a similar inclusion in the Roman liturgy. The first epiclesis comes after the *Sanctus*. The *Sanctus* itself is the conclusion to the sacrifice of praise and to the prayers of petition for the acceptance of offerings that mark the Alexandrian anaphora. It is the final word of praise of the mystery of the suffusion of the world by the holiness of God, in creation and redemption, the final words of the hymn of the Church's offering. Following the *Sanctus*, the congregation in the person of its minister is moved to implore that by the descent of the Holy Spirit this fullness of divine glory may fill the offering which it has made. This leads to the recital of the Supper narrative, which is given as the motivation for this request.

The second invocation of the Spirit comes after the narrative and the anamnesis whereby the death of the Lord is proclaimed in expectation of his coming. It is then in remembering the mysteries of Christ's flesh that the Church prays for the sending of the Holy Spirit upon the loaves and cups offered, that they may be sanctified and perfected and become the body and the blood of the covenant. This is for the sake of those who, having brought them and praised God, will partake of them and through them participate in the praise of the divine name, or in God's holiness and glory. In making the petition, the Church remembers how the Spirit is present everywhere and fills everything, and how it worked through the Law and the prophets and the Apostles, and shares the throne of God's kingdom together with the Son. Rather than an epiclesis that

28. Mazza, *Origins*, 243–282. See also Louis Bouyer, *Eucharistie. Théologie et spiritualité de la prière eucharistique* (Paris: Desclée, 1966), 193–196, 207–212. An English translation of the prayer may be found in R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd ed. (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1987), 57–66.

has a different purpose than the first, it repeats its main elements and complements it.

What can be seen from this anaphora is how well the request for the presence and action of the Spirit harmonizes with its own sacrificial language and theology. The Church's offering of praise for God's deeds, and its prayers that its offering be acceptable, is perfected through the action of the Holy Spirit, whose action fills it with divine holiness and glory so that it may truly resound to the glory of God's name. It is also the sending of the Spirit which sanctifies the gifts of bread and wine so that they may become the body and blood of Christ and so that their consumption may bring them to a fuller share in God's holiness and in the praise of the divine name, a holiness and a praise which are to continue to be perfected until the coming of the Lord in the visible manifestation of his glory.

It is in fact in light of the singing of the Holy that the first epiclesis is introduced into Eucharistic Prayers II and III of the new *Ordo Missae*, even if it sounds muted in comparison with the Liturgy of Mark. However, the second epiclesis is purely a prayer for the grace of the Spirit on those who consume the body and blood of Christ. Whatever criticism may be made of the Roman liturgy's form of double epiclesis, there is nonetheless material in the revised Missal on which *IGMR2002* might have drawn in presenting the action of the Holy Spirit in the Church's commemorative prayer and in the sanctification of the gifts. Seeing how the Roman prayers draw on the Liturgy of Mark, and with this liturgy itself in mind, we can see how a harmonious and organic development of the Roman liturgy's sacrificial theology, open to the influences of the East, may integrate an invocation of the Holy Spirit.

Theology and Rite

There are some instances of rubrical directives where the influence of *IGMR*'s somewhat limited theology of eucharistic sacrifice is apparent. This pertains in particular to the preparation of gifts and the rite of communion.

Preparation of Gifts

Number 73 of the Instruction addresses the preparation of the gifts before the Eucharistic Prayer. In what it says, it is faced by the dilemma of how to relate its directives to the theology of sacrifice that it has already given. How may the gifts of the faithful be said to belong in the sacramental commemoration of the once-and-for-all sacrifice of Christ? The Instruction says that the "gifts" (*dona*), the "bread and wine," the "offerings" (*oblationes*) are brought forward as part of the preparation. Indeed, no. 74 even refers to this part of the Mass as the offertory, when it mentions the *cantus ad offertorium* (see no. 37 below).

Sense has to be attributed to these offerings made by the people, though the matter is made somewhat ambiguous when the Instruction notes that today the bread and wine do not come from the people themselves as in earlier times.

They do not bring offerings, yet they are said to make gifts and offerings. In light of this situation the Instruction states that, even though the people do not today offer of their own possessions, the rite “still retains its force and its spiritual significance.” What this force and spiritual significance could be is unclear in light of three uncoordinated assertions. In the first place, this action is said to be a preparation of the gifts to be consecrated rather than an offering; in the second, the things brought are still said to be gifts and offerings; while in the third, it is said that the people do not offer of their own possessions. It is not clear what the significance is supposed to be, though no doubt the position taken is in line with the theology that allows a spiritual but not a material or sacramental offering to the royal priesthood. Talking of a spiritual significance which can remain, even though the corporeal and earthly significance has disappeared, undermines the sense of a rite that is rooted in human life and its vivid corporeality.

Sacramental Communion

Given its stress on offering sacrifice in commemoration of Christ’s own, *IGMR2002* is jejune on the meaning of the Communion and the Communion rite. In the Preamble, it says only that the people who offer their spiritual sacrifice are “made one by sharing in the Communion of Christ’s Body and Blood” (*qui per Communionem Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in unum coalescit*, no. 5). In no. 85 it does add that receiving from hosts consecrated at the Mass being celebrated, or receiving of the chalice, are signs whereby it stands out more clearly that the people “participate in the sacrifice actually being celebrated” (*participatio sacrificii, quod actu celebratur*). In no. 281 on communion under both kinds, the Instruction finds that this is a more evident sign of participation in the eucharistic banquet and the ratification of the New Covenant “in the Blood of the Lord” (*in Sanguine Domini*).

Something more would need to be said on how sharing at the communion table is integral to the sacramental sign of the commemoration of the Lord’s sacrifice. Do the prayers of the Sacramentary shed any further light on this connection between sacrifice, proclamation and communion? Prayers after Communion in the old Roman sacramentaries do not use the word *hostia*. They do, however, continue to use cultic and sacrificial vocabulary, especially through the words *libamen* and *libatio*, which in sacrifice meant partaking of drink offerings. God is asked to give earthly and eternal benefits to those who partake of the gift (*munus*) and drink offering of the Lord’s body and blood.²⁹

How this is connected with the act of offering itself, being as it were its completion, is expressed in the following post-Communion prayer from *Veronense*: “Filled with the libation of the sacred body and precious blood, we ask you, Lord our God: grant that what we enact with faithful devotion, we may

29. *Veronense*, nos. 6, 69, 441, 561, 585 and 1202.

obtain by certain redemption.”³⁰ In one of the prefaces of the *Hadrianum* in which thanksgiving has turned to petition, similar expression is given to this total sacramental action through using the figure of the offering of Melchisedech,³¹ which as we know is also found in the Roman Canon. The preface recalls first the *oblatio* or offering which he made, then the gifts (*munera*) upon the altar, and finally the consumption (*libamen*) of what has been offered.

These prayers may serve as background to better understand the doctrinal positions of the Council of Trent, which in separate decrees state that the Lord’s death and self-offering is represented in the sacrifice of the Eucharist and that it is proclaimed in the act of consumption. It is when these two assertions are brought together to speak of the sacramental action in its totality that we can appreciate the eucharistic action as the action of the whole congregation, priest and people. In their respective ways, they together celebrate the sacrament and memorial of the Lord’s death. The people’s action, the priest’s prayers and the people’s communion, together constitute the sacrament and memorial sacrifice of the Lord’s Pasch.

Why the Church and its members can make offerings, either of praise, devotion, or gifts, through which the redemptive sacrifice of Christ is commemorated and celebrated, is made clear through the ways in which the assembly is designated. It is the people of God (*plebs, populus*)³² and the Church (*aeclesia*)³³ of God, the body of the Church made up of many members (*corpus aeclesiae*),³⁴ which has been made one through the power of baptism and the sanctification of the Spirit. It is as such a people that they make their offerings, so that Christ and the Spirit are at work in them. It is not a random gathering, but the gathering of those who have been given the grace to partake of the exchange of natures brought about by the mysteries of Christ’s flesh.

This leads us to take note that some other prayers from the old sacramentaries show how this conception of sacrifice is grounded in the image of commerce or exchange that is brought about through the incarnation. By taking on human

30. *Veronense*, no. 16: *Corporis sacri et praetiosi sanguinis repleti libamine quaesumus, Deus noster: quod pia devotione gerimus, certa redemptione capiamus.*

31. *Hadrianum*, no. 821: . . . *te supplices deprecamur, ut altare hoc sanctis usibus praeparatum, caelesti dedicatione sanctifices, et sicut Melchisedech sacerdotis praecipui oblationem dignatione mirabili suscepisti, ita imposito novo huic altari munera semper accepta ferre digneris, ut populus qui in hanc ecclesiae domum sanctam convenit, per haec libamina caelesti sanctificatione salvatus animarum quoque suarum salutem perpetuam consequatur* (“ . . . with supplication we beseech you, that you may sanctify this altar prepared by holy usage, and as by wonderful condescension you accepted the oblation of the high priest Melchisedech, so may you always grant that the gifts placed on this new altar may be made acceptable, so that the people which has gathered in this holy house of the church, saved through these libations by heavenly sanctification, may attain the eternal salvation of their souls”).

32. E.g., *Veronense*, nos. 3, 8, 17, 36, 87, 100, 168, 212 (where the reference is to the offerings of your people, *hostia populi tui*), 241, 286 (*oblations populi*), 279, 581, 698, 1230.

33. E.g., *Veronense*, nos. 3, 303, 310, 316, 412, 425.

34. *Veronense*, no. 412.

nature, Christ gave humanity a share in his divine nature, so that rather than being a bartering between things of equal value the exchange is in fact a granting of the abundance which the divine gives to the nature taken up. The sacrament of the Eucharist becomes in turn the means for prolonging this exchange and is itself called a sacred exchange (*sancta commercia*) through which those who offer the sacrifice of praise receive the form of him whom they commemorate, the absolution of sins, or help in the present life and pledge of eternal joy.³⁵

A knowledge of the old Roman liturgy, its actions of offering, its offertory prayers and the prayer of the Canon shows how inclusive is the ritual commemoration of the death and resurrection of Christ, even when it is designated by words of offering and sacrifice. Within the assembly of those come together in faith it runs from offering of gifts, through the Canon, to the communion in the gifts sanctified by the prayer of anamnestic thanksgiving. It is with devotion that the people are said to offer their gifts and their praise, or indeed that their devotion in its external expression is one of the things offered. This devotion is given its final sacramental expression in eating and drinking of the body and blood offered in sacrifice through the Church's commemorative thanksgiving. Therefore, the total sacrament of memorial sacrificial enactment includes: the offering of the earthly gifts of bread and wine, and along with this other gifts, acts of devotion, or devotion itself. In the commemorative sacrifice of praise offered over these gifts and all that they express, the Church is united with the once-and-for-all sacrifice of Christ. Finally, the Church assembled partakes of the sacrificial food and drink of Christ's body and blood, the people's own gifts transformed by his grace.

Attention to this liturgical tradition would have enabled the authors of the *IGMR2002* to avoid the implication that participation in offering sacrifice is one thing and communion another.³⁶ Communion of the assembly appears to be participation in the sacrifice enacted, and not integral to the very signification that this is by its sacramental nature communion in Christ's sacrifice and an act of memorial proclamation. In *IGMR2002*, what the priest is said to do and what the faithful are said to do may seem to be parallel actions rather than one total sacramental action.

Only in light of this separation, which is more than a distinction of roles, is it possible to treat of the issue of communion under one or under two kinds as the Instruction does. While saying that this mode of communion is more significant, the document quotes Trent's assertion that in receiving under only one kind nobody is deprived of the grace needed. There is no acknowledgment at this point that Trent dealt with this in a very particular historical situation, wishing to save itself from the political and ecclesiastical implications of meeting the demand from north European countries to give the chalice to the laity.

35. *Hadrianum*, nos. 37, 214, 421. On *commercium* in *Veronense*, see nos. 69, 90, 1249, 1260, 1256.

36. This distinction is very clear in *Mediator Dei*, no. 112.

Apart from a lapse in historical awareness, and apart from being in present circumstances a strange and stingy pastoral principle, it is also weak in the theological requirement of fidelity to ritual signs for the sake both of sacramental meaning and of bodily and spiritual participation in the sacrament.

The reference to the scriptural norm mentioned in the Instruction draws attention to the task of liturgical theology to interpret sacramental signs, words, and actions. A theology that is a presentation of the sacramental sign would be a theology of communion in bread and wine, with thanksgiving, in virtue of faith in the reality and mystery of the Word made flesh, to renew and recapitulate what God created by this same word.

Organic Growth

One of the accomplishments of focusing on the Church here and now gathered into a liturgical assembly is the importance of the particularity of each assembly. At the micro level, the presider is instructed to shape whatever instructions are necessary “in order that they respond to the understanding of those participating” (*ut participantium captui respondeant*, IGMR2002, no. 31). At the macro level it means taking into account the culture of a local church. IGMR2002 adds five full paragraphs on the necessity of adaptation to the local culture (nos. 22–26).³⁷ Some adaptations are given over to the responsibility of the local bishop or the conference of bishops, while other adaptations are left to the presiding priest. These adaptations are made to “respond better to the needs, preparation, and culture of the participants” (*necessitatibus, praeparationi et ingenio participantium magis respondentes*, no. 24). IGMR2002 leaves no doubt that the subject of the liturgical action is not the universal Church or even a generic local church, but a specific local church here and now gathered.

Given this view of the organic growth of the Roman Liturgy in its assimilation of cultural traditions, some questions need to be considered. The point of what has been said on sacrifice is that if the doctrinal principles about sacrifice are to follow in the tradition of the Roman liturgy, organic growth would require the inclusion of the offerings of the faithful in the sacrifice of praise and in the memorial communion with Christ in the sacrifice of Supper and Cross. However, it needs to be asked whether the revision of the Roman Missal has in fact been done in line with the principles of organic growth, and whether indeed given the current mutual interaction between Western and Eastern liturgical traditions a different liturgical growth may be in order.

37. It should be noted that IGMR2002 speaks specifically of “adaptation” when it addresses the question of cultural accommodation; “inculturation” appears only in no. 398 and in very cautionary terms (see Francis and Neville, 465–466 below). This follows the tone and intent of *Varietates Legitimae* (*VarLeg*) or the Fourth Instruction on Inculturation where a general presentation on inculturation is given, but a preference for the more conservative adaptation is set forth.

As we know, the Roman Canon after the initial thanksgiving and the Holy, continues with the offering of the gifts of the faithful through the prayer of the priest. The new Eucharistic Prayers of the revised Missal make mention of the gifts of the people (*dona, munera*) in asking the descent of the Spirit through the first epiclesis. This is not, however, for their offering but for their transformation. Verbs of offering occur only after the Supper narrative and in strict conjunction with the anamnesis and second epiclesis. This is in line with Eastern liturgies, which do not neglect the offering of the bread and wine by the faithful but are more reticent about giving it the kind of prominence that it has in the Roman Liturgy. This serves to highlight the primacy of the offering of praise, the action of the Holy Spirit in the synaxis, and the anticipation of receiving the body and blood of Christ at the communion table.

In short, what the Roman liturgy of the Mass now offers us is a mixture of liturgical traditions, opening options to congregations as to what line to follow. The organic growth may be with the larger tradition with its emphasis on the memorial and epicletic sacrifice of praise rather than on the offering of gifts. Even in this case, however, some sacramental inclusion of the offering of the gifts is taken into account in the prayer, and the sanctifying prayer is one proclaimed with and for the congregation. In other words, even in these new developments there is no foundation for the theology of the *IGMR2002* that marks off priest's action and people's action so sharply.

When the principles of interpretation invoke the suprarregional character of the Roman liturgy, this raises the issue of how it may be integrated into a variety of cultures. The liturgical historian³⁸ and the cultural anthropologist may well question this affirmation on the basis of an examination of texts and rites, as well as principle. For example, in revising *Hadrianum* for its use among Nordic peoples, there was simply an addition of material, something which does not amount to inculturation. Indeed, the well-known liturgical historian, Edmund Bishop,³⁹ in writing of the genius of the Roman Rite, saw these as simple accretions, not in organic keeping with what was the wont in Rome, as indeed he was also inclined to do for the collections known under the common name of Gelasian sacramentaries. However, putting aside questions of style, what a theological commentary may ask is whether the Instruction is in organic and harmonious continuity with the original Roman tradition when it enunciates its own theology.

This hermeneutical principle, which says that even inculturation has to be done in harmony with the Roman liturgy, is even more ambiguous as a result of the mingling of Eastern and Western traditions noted above. This may indeed be of advantage in allowing for peoples to take their own cultures and their own faith expression into account, if ever curial authorities show themselves

38. See David N. Power, "Inculturation, the Roman Rite, and Plurality of Liturgies," *Pastoral Music* 22 (June 1998): 26–29.

39. Edmund Bishop, *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918).

more ready to allow peoples to develop their own Eucharistic Prayers and their own liturgical action. Even as it is, a number of unofficial prayers from the continents of Africa and Asia could be studied for the way in which they relate on the one hand to a past inclusive of several eucharistic traditions and on the other the religious outlook of their own cultural and religious past.⁴⁰

Conclusion

In this theological commentary, we have pointed to the relation of *IGMR2002* to earlier editions, and we have also addressed its more fundamental theological principles that guide rubrical directives and attempt to offer a pastoral understanding of liturgical celebration. While there is much that is positive, a revision of the theology of eucharistic sacrifice and a fuller integration of a theology of the Holy Spirit would have further consequences. It seems that there is still work to be done on the revision of the Roman liturgy in keeping with patristic and liturgical sources. One may conclude that in the light of the doctrinal and liturgical tradition of the Roman Church, the doctrinal part of *IGMR2002* needs a further elaboration, one that would have implications for the ceremonial directives.

40. For a brief survey of African ritual developments and texts, see F. Kabasele Lumbala, *Celebrating Jesus Christ in Africa. Liturgy and Inculturation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998), 19–57.

Preamble

(*PROCEMIUM*)

Margaret Mary Kelleher

Overview

The Preamble or introduction was not part of the first edition of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (IGMR1969), but it did appear in the second edition of the Instruction (IGMR1970), which was issued with the first *editio typica* of the revised *Missale Romanum* (MR1970). The content of the Preamble has not undergone any substantial changes in succeeding editions, including the most recent version of IGMR2002.

The topics treated in the Preamble are gathered under three headings: “A Witness to Unchanged Faith” (*Testimonium fidei immutatae*), “A Witness to Unbroken Tradition” (*Traditio non intermissa declaratur*), and “Accommodation to New Conditions” (*Ad novas rerum condiciones accommodatio*). These headings illustrate a consistent concern in the Preamble to connect the content of the revised Missal with the Church’s tradition even while recognizing that significant changes have been made in its liturgical practice. Statements made in the Preamble are supported by references to the documents of Vatican II (1962–1965), especially *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (SC) but also *Lumen Gentium* (LG) and *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (PO), the decrees of the Council of Trent (1545–1563), several papal documents, an instruction from the Sacred Congregation of Rites (*Eucharisticum Mysterium*), and several Eucharistic Prayers. The decrees of Trent are used in two ways. Most references to Trent are made to show that what is in the revised Missal is consistent with what was taught at Trent. At other times, the intent is to show that a practice being implemented in the revised Missal is not in contradiction with the intent of what was said at the Council of Trent.

The Preamble introduces a number of significant theological and pastoral topics that will reappear in various sections of IGMR2002. They are: the sacrificial nature of the Mass, the mystery of the Lord’s real presence, the nature of the ministerial priesthood, the priesthood of the faithful, the Eucharist as action of the Church, the importance of fostering participation in the liturgy, the catechetical nature of the liturgy, the use of the vernacular, the significance of sacramental reception of the Eucharist, the possibility for Communion under both

**Including Adaptations for the Dioceses
of the United States of America***

Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani**

PREAMBLE***

1. When he was about to celebrate with his disciples the Passover meal in which he instituted the sacrifice of his Body and Blood, Christ the Lord gave instructions

PROCEMIUM

1. Cenam paschalem cum discipulis celebraturus, in qua sacrificium sui Corporis et Sanguinis instituit, Christus Dominus cenaculum magnum, stratum (*Lc 22, 12*)

kinds, the importance of continuity in the tradition, the need for incorporating new elements into the liturgy and accommodating others because of contemporary needs and circumstances, and the recognition that participation in the Eucharist should promote holiness and a deeper Christian life.

In its recognition of the need for both continuity and change, the Preamble sets forth a dynamic notion of tradition. It envisages a living tradition, one that has roots in the origins and history of the Church, but one that is also organic and can grow and manifest itself in diverse situations. This notion of a living tradition appears in various ways in the Preamble, but is especially evident in the final section that treats “Accommodation to New Conditions” (*Ad Novas Rerum Condiciones Accommodatio*). Here we find the explication of a foundational principle—that changes can be made in the liturgy to accommodate contemporary needs and circumstances and that these changes can include elements that are new to the liturgy. This principle is developed in a number of other places in *IGMR2002*. For example, nos. 23–26 introduce the possibility of making accommodations and adaptations in the liturgy in order to make it pastorally more effective, and cultural diversity is one of the reasons given for such change. In addition, *IGMR2002* has a new chapter (Chapter IX) that treats the topic of “Adaptations Within the Competence of Bishops and Bishops’ Conferences” (*De Aptationibus quae Episcopis eorumque Conferentiis Competunt*).

It is clear in the Preamble that the basis for any changes to be introduced in the Mass is a pastoral concern that the faithful might be able to participate in the liturgy and be nourished by such participation. Such concern was foundational for the Second Vatican Council’s mandate for the revision of the liturgy (SC, no. 14) and, in particular, the rite of the Mass (SC, no. 50). It was repeated

* The English text of the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* is that of the published version by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* © 2002, ICEL. All rights reserved. Liturgy Documentary Series 2 (Washington, D.C.: USCCB, 2003).

** The Latin text of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* is that of the published version of this Instruction found in the *Missale Romanum, editio iuxta typica tertia* (2002).

*** In this and all subsequent chapters, footnotes to the text of *GIRM2003* and *IGMR2002* are gathered at the end of each respective chapter in this volume.

that a large, furnished upper room should be prepared (Lk 22:12). The Church has always regarded this command as applying also to herself when she gives directions about the preparation of people's hearts and minds and of the places, rites, and texts for the celebration of the Most Holy Eucharist. The current norms, prescribed in keeping with the will of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, and the new Missal that the Church of the Roman Rite is to use from now on in the celebration of Mass are also evidence of the great concern of the Church, of her faith, and of her unchanged love for the great mystery of the Eucharist. They likewise bear witness to the Church's continuous and unbroken tradition, irrespective of the introduction of certain new features.

parari mandavit. Quod quidem iussum etiam ad se pertinere Ecclesia semper est arbitrata, cum de iis statuebat, quæ, in disponendis hominum animis, locis, ritibus, textibus, ad sanctissimæ Eucharistiæ celebrationem spectarent. Normæ quoque hodiernæ, quæ, voluntate Concilii Œcumenici Vaticani II innixæ, præscriptæ sunt, atque novum Missale, quo Ecclesia Ritus romani in Missa celebranda posthac utetur, iterum sunt argumentum huius sollicitudinis Ecclesiæ, eius fidei immutatique amoris erga summum mysterium eucharisticum, atque continuam contextamque eius traditionem, quamquam res novæ quædam inductæ sunt, testantur.

by Pope Paul VI (d. 1978) in his 1969 *Apostolic Constitution*,¹ in which he approved the new *MR1970*, and it appears in a number of places in this Preamble.² This guiding principle will reappear throughout *IGMR2002*.³ Both the Preamble and the whole document illustrate fidelity to Vatican II's pastoral concern.

1. The Preamble begins with a claim that the Church's practice of giving directions for the celebration of the Eucharist is rooted in the instructions Jesus Christ gave to his disciples when he told them to prepare the Passover meal (Luke 22:12). Although questions of biblical interpretation and historical accuracy can be raised here, the statement that "the Church has always regarded this command as applying also to herself when she gives directions . . ." (*Quod quidem iussum etiam ad se pertinere Ecclesia semper est arbitrata, cum de iis statuebat*) is clearly an attempt to establish continuity in the tradition by suggesting that the Church has acted in the name of Christ whenever it has issued such instructions. In addition to making a connection between the norms governing the new Missal and Christ, this introductory paragraph also connects them with the Second Vatican Council and "the Church's continuous and unbroken tradition, irrespective of the introduction of certain new features" (*continuum contextamque eius traditionem, quamquam res novæ quædam inductæ sunt, testantur*). Here we have the first indication of the notion of the liturgy as a living tradition, one constructed by weaving the old and new together.

1. *Missale Romanum*, AAS 61 (1969): 217–222.

2. E.g., nos. 5, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15.

3. E.g., nos. 16, 20, 55, 95 and 289.

A Witness to Unchanged Faith

2. The sacrificial nature of the Mass, solemnly asserted by the Council of Trent in accordance with the Church's universal tradition,¹ was reaffirmed by the Second Vatican Council, which offered these significant words about the Mass: "At the Last Supper our Savior instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice of his Body and Blood, by which he would perpetuate the Sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries until he should come again, thus entrusting to the Church, his beloved Bride, the memorial of his death and resurrection."²

Testimonium fidei immutatæ

2. Missæ natura sacrificialis, a Concilio Tridentino, quod universæ traditioni Ecclesiæ congruebat, sollemniter asserta,¹ rursus enuntiata est a Concilio Vaticano II, quod circa Missam hæc significantia protulit verba: « Salvator noster in Cena novissima sacrificium eucharisticum Corporis et Sanguinis sui instituit, quo sacrificium crucis in sæcula, donec veniret, perpetuaret, atque adeo Ecclesiæ dilectæ sponsæ memoriale concrederet mortis et resurrectionis suæ ».²

A Witness to Unchanged Faith

2. This article focuses on the sacrificial nature of the Mass. The intent here is not to engage in a full discussion of this complex topic, but to show that the *IGMR2002* is in continuity with Trent. The first paragraph begins by noting that the Second Vatican Council had reaffirmed what the Council of Trent had solemnly asserted about the sacrificial nature of the Mass. In support of this, the Preamble quotes *SC*: "At the last supper . . . our Savior instituted the eucharistic sacrifice of his body and blood. This he did in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the cross throughout the ages until he should come again, and so to entrust to his beloved spouse, the church, a memorial of his death and resurrection" (no. 47). It is interesting that the rest of *SC*, no. 47, which elaborates on the eucharistic memorial as a "sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, a paschal banquet. . ." was not included in the quotation given here in the instruction. This choice may be due to the emphasis on continuity with Trent where the notions of the Eucharist as a sacrament of love and unity and as a paschal meal were not treated under the category of sacrifice. The image of paschal banquet does appear later in *IGMR2002*, no. 72 where *SC*, no. 47 is also given as a reference.

Working with the principle that there is a correspondence between the Church's prayer and its belief, the Preamble proceeds to use a prayer from an ancient sacramentary and Eucharistic Prayers III and IV, newly composed for *MRI970*, to show continuity in the Church's teaching regarding the sacrificial nature of the Mass. These sources are used to show the Church's belief that, in the eucharistic commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, his redemptive mission is actualized. In other words, the Eucharist is an effective sacrifice. The Council of Trent affirmed that the sacrifice of the Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice⁴ and

4. Council of Trent, Session 22, ch. 2, in Tanner, 2:733.

What the Council thus teaches is expressed constantly in the formulas of the Mass. This teaching, which is concisely expressed in the statement already contained in the ancient Sacramentary commonly known as the Leonine—"As often as the commemoration of this sacrifice is celebrated, the work of our redemption is carried out"³—is aptly and accurately developed in the Eucharistic Prayers. For in these prayers the priest, while he performs the commemoration, turns towards God, even in the name of the whole people, renders him thanks, and offers the living and holy Sacrifice, namely, the Church's offering and the Victim by whose immolation God willed to be appeased;⁴ and he prays that the Body and Blood of Christ may be a sacrifice acceptable to the Father and salvific for the whole world.⁵

Quod sic a Concilio docetur, id formulis Missæ continenter exprimitur. Etenim doctrina, quæ hac sententia, iam in antiquo Sacramentario, vulgo Leoniano nuncupato, exstante, presse significatur: « quoties huius hostiæ commemoratio celebratur, opus nostræ redemptionis exercetur », ³ apte accurateque explicatur in Precibus eucharisticis; in his enim sacerdos, dum anamnesin peragit, ad Deum nomine etiam totius populi conversus, ei gratias persolvit et sacrificium offert vivum et sanctum, oblationem scilicet Ecclesiæ et hostiam, cuius immolatione ipse Deus voluit placari, ⁴ atque orat, ut Corpus et Sanguis Christi sint Patri sacrificium acceptabile et toti mundo salutare. ⁵

IGMR2002 seems to be demonstrating continuity with this position in its references to the language used in the two Eucharistic Prayers. For example, in referring to Eucharistic Prayer III, the Preamble notes that the priest "offers the living and holy Sacrifice, namely, the Church's offering and the Victim by whose immolation God willed to be appeased" (*et sacrificium offert vivum et sanctum, oblationem scilicet Ecclesiae et hostiam, cuius immolatione ipse Deus voluit placari*). The translation of that part of the prayer in the present Sacramentary is "the Victim whose death has reconciled us to yourself." In his commentary on this prayer, Enrico Mazza calls attention to the problematic nature of "victim" language for an adequate understanding of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist and suggests that it is possible to offer a translation that avoids that word while still remaining faithful to the Latin.⁵ In his study of the Council of Trent's teaching on the sacrificial nature of the Mass, David Power notes that the primacy given to the language of propitiation meant that other types of sacrifice (e.g., thanksgiving) received a secondary status. He also points out that Trent's tendency to equate sacrifice with the offering of a victim led to a very limited understanding of the nature of the Eucharist as sacrifice.⁶

5. Enrico Mazza, *The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: Pueblo, 1986), 136–137.

6. David N. Power, *The Sacrifice We Offer: The Tridentine Dogma and Its Reinterpretation* (New York: Crossroad, 1987), 151–154; also, see the discussion of this topic by David Power and Catherine Vincie, 61–64 above.

In this new Missal, then, the Church's rule of prayer (*lex orandi*) corresponds to her perennial rule of belief (*lex credendi*), by which namely we are taught that the Sacrifice of the Cross and its sacramental renewal in the Mass, which Christ the Lord instituted at the Last Supper and commanded the Apostles to do in his memory, are one and the same, differing only in the manner of offering, and that consequently the Mass is at once a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, of propitiation and satisfaction.

3. Moreover, the wondrous mystery of the Lord's real presence under the Eucharistic species, reaffirmed by the Second Vatican Council⁶ and other documents of the Church's Magisterium⁷ in the same sense and with the same words that the Council of Trent had proposed as a matter of faith,⁸ is proclaimed in the celebration

Ita in novo Missali lex orandi Ecclesiae respondet perenni legi credendi, qua nempe monemur unum et idem esse, excepta diversa offerendi ratione, crucis sacrificium eiusque in Missa sacramentalem renovationem, quam in Cena novissima Christus Dominus instituit Apostolicisque faciendam mandavit in sui memoriam, atque proinde Missam simul esse sacrificium laudis, gratiarum actionis, propitiatorium et satisfactorium.

3. Mirabile etiam mysterium praesentiae realis Domini sub speciebus eucharisticis, a Concilio Vaticano II⁶ aliisque Ecclesiae Magisterii documentis⁷ eodem sensu eademque sententia, quibus Concilium Tridentinum id credendum proposuerat,⁸ confirmatum, in Missae celebratione declaratur non solum ipsis verbis consecrationis, quibus Christus per trans-

This part of the Preamble comes to a conclusion by reaffirming that the prayers of the new Missal correspond with the Church's belief that "the Sacrifice of the Cross and its sacramental renewal in the Mass . . . are one and the same, differing only in the manner of offering, and that consequently the Mass is at once a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, of propitiation and satisfaction" (*crucis sacrificium eiusque in Missa sacramentalem renovationem . . . atque proinde Missam simul esse sacrificium laudis, gratiarum actionis, propitiatorium et satisfactorium*). This statement is in continuity with Trent because that council did not deny that the Eucharist is a sacrifice of thanksgiving. It condemned those who taught that the sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving.⁷ The statement quoted above is also significant because it links the language of sacrifice and sacrament.⁸

While *IGMR2002* has used liturgical prayers to demonstrate the continuity of the Church's belief regarding the sacrificial nature of the Mass between the Council of Trent and the Missal revised in light of the Second Vatican Council, it has been selective in doing so. It would be a mistake to read the Instruction as claiming that the Church's whole tradition of eucharistic prayers supports a particular understanding of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist. Those who have studied that tradition would suggest otherwise. For example, Edward

7. Council of Trent Session 22, c. 3 in Tanner, 2:735.

8. See Kevin W. Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist* (New York/Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2005), 231. See Power, *The Sacrifice We Offer*, 130–131 for his statement that the idea of the Eucharist as a sacramental sacrifice is in line with the teaching of Trent.

of Mass not only by means of the very words of consecration, by which Christ becomes present through transubstantiation, but also by that interior disposition and outward expression of supreme reverence and adoration in which the Eucharistic Liturgy is carried out. For the same reason the Christian people is drawn on Holy Thursday of the Lord's Supper, and on the solemnity of the Most Holy Body and Blood of Christ, to venerate this wonderful Sacrament by a special form of adoration.

substantiationem præsens redditur, sed etiam sensu et exhibitione summæ reverentiæ et adorationis, quæ in Liturgia eucharistica fieri contingit. Eadem de causa populus christianus adducitur, ut feria V Hebdomadæ sanctæ in Cena Domini, et in sollemnitate Ss.mi Corporis et Sanguinis Christi, hoc admirabile Sacramentum peculiarem in modum excolat adorando.

Kilmartin criticized the modern Catholic theology of eucharistic sacrifice as a synthesis that is weak on biblical grounds and in its integration of the role of the Holy Spirit and suggested that a study of classical eucharistic prayers would provide a more authentic theology of the Eucharist.⁹

3. This section of the Preamble focuses on “the wondrous mystery of the Lord’s real presence under the Eucharistic species” (*Mirabile . . . mysterium praesentiae realis Domini sub speciebus eucharisticis*). The concern is to show that the teaching of the Council of Trent had been reaffirmed in the documents of the Second Vatican Council and in other magisterial documents. While the documents given in footnotes to support this claim certainly do reaffirm the Church’s belief in the real presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements, several of them provide a significant context for that presence. SC, no. 7 introduces this context by identifying multiple ways in which Christ is present in the sacrifice of the Mass. He is present in the person of the minister, in the eucharistic elements, in the sacraments, in the Word of the Scriptures, and in the Church gathered in his name. In his encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*, Pope Paul VI elaborated on these diverse forms of the presence of Christ. In referring to the presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist he noted that “this presence is called the *real presence* not to exclude the other kinds as though they were not real, but because it is real par excellence, since it is substantial, in the sense that Christ whole and entire, God and man, becomes present.”¹⁰ Here he gave a note to the Council of Trent. It is unfortunate that this teaching of the multiple ways in which Christ is present in the Mass is not part of this section of the Preamble. However, it does appear later in no. 27 of *IGMR2002*.

As part of the attempt to show continuity with the faith expressed at the Council of Trent, this section refers to “the very words of consecration, by which

9. See Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daly (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 365–383.

10. No. 39, in DOL, no. 1183.

4. Further, the nature of the ministerial priesthood proper to a Bishop and a priest, who offer the Sacrifice in the person of Christ and who preside over the gathering of the holy people, is evident in the form of the rite itself, by reason of the more prominent place and office of the priest.

4. Natura vero sacerdotii ministerialis, quod episcopi et presbyteri proprium est, qui in persona Christi sacrificium offerunt cœtuique populi sancti præsent, in ipsius ritus forma, e præstantiore loco et munere eiusdem sacerdotis elucet. Huius vero muneris rationes edicuntur et perspicue ac

Christ becomes present through transubstantiation" (*ipsis verbis consecrationis, quibus Christus per transubstantiationem præsens redditur*). The Council of Trent, itself, was more nuanced in its use of language. It chose to use the term "*aptissime*" in reference to its choice of the language of "transubstantiation."¹¹ In doing so it was recognizing the suitability or appropriateness of the term. As Edward Kilmartin has noted, "Trent did not canonize the philosophical explanation underlying the scholastic theology of transubstantiation."¹² The final concern of this section of the Preamble is with the appropriate response to the Lord's real presence in the eucharistic species. It notes that the Church's belief in the real presence is also proclaimed "by that interior disposition and outward expression of supreme reverence and adoration in which the Eucharistic Liturgy is carried out" (*sensu et exhibitione summae reverentiae et adorationis, quae in Liturgia eucharistica fieri contingit*) and relates this to the practices of adoration that take place on Holy Thursday and on the solemnity of the Most Holy Body and Blood of Christ. Here we see continuity with the Council of Trent, which did defend the practice of the adoration of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist. However, that council also recognized that the sacrament had been instituted by Christ in order to be consumed.¹³ It is interesting to note that "supreme reverence" was chosen to translate "*summae reverentiae*." There seems to be an intent to overstate the need for reverence while, in contrast, the word "*summae*" is not translated in GIRM1975. In fact, several instructions about showing reverence or adoration to Christ present in the sacrament have been added to this most recent version.¹⁴

4. This article is concerned with the nature of the ministerial priesthood while no. 5 will attend to the priesthood of the faithful. The order of these two sections is surprisingly inconsistent with that which was set out in *LG*. In that document, the mystery of the Church and the Church as the people of God are

11. Council of Trent, Session 13, c. 2 in Tanner, 2:697.

12. Kilmartin, 179; Karl Rahner, "The Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," *Theological Investigations IV*, trans. Kevin Smyth (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1966), 287–311; Edward Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, trans. N. D. Smith (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1968), 44–45.

13. Council of Trent, Session 13, ch. 5 in Tanner, 2:695. See Kilmartin, 170 for his commentary on this.

14. E.g., nos. 160, 179 and 274.

The meaning of this office is enunciated and explained clearly and at greater length, in the Preface for the Chrism Mass on Holy Thursday, the day commemorating the institution of the priesthood. The Preface brings to light the conferral of the priestly power accomplished through the laying on of hands; and, by listing the various duties, it describes that power, which is the continuation of the power of Christ the High Priest of the New Testament.

fusius explanantur in gratiarum actione Missæ chrismatiss, feria V Hebdomadæ sanctæ; quo videlicet die institutio sacerdotii commemoratur. In illa enim collatio potestatis sacerdotalis per manuum impositionem facta illustratur; atque ipsa potestas, singulis officiis recensitis, describitur, quæ est continuatio potestatis Christi, Summi Pontificis Novi Testamenti.

presented before the hierarchical nature of the Church is treated, and the foundational nature of baptism for membership in Christ and participation in his priesthood is quite clear (*LG*, nos. 7 and 10).

The focus of no. 4 is “the nature of the ministerial priesthood proper to a Bishop and a priest, who offer the Sacrifice in the person of Christ and who preside over the gathering of the holy people. . . .” (*Natura vero sacerdotii ministerialis, quod episcopi et presbyteri proprium est, qui in persona Christi sacrificium offerunt coetuique populi sancti praesident*). The word *episcopi* was added to *IGMR2002*. Previous versions of the Latin text had only *presbyteri*. *GIRM1975* translates this term as “presbyter,” but *GIRM2003* uses the word “priest.” This seems odd, given the emphasis placed on literal translation of terms in the most recent instruction on translation. The emphasis on the priest offering the sacrifice in the person of Christ is faithful to statements made by the Council of Trent, although there are no references to that council. There are also no references to the Second Vatican Council. The language of no. 4 does not reflect *SC*, no. 48, which makes it clear that members of the Church offer the sacrifice with the priest.

The theology of ministerial priesthood in this section is one that stresses priestly power. It calls attention to the more prominent place and office of the priest in the rite, identifies Holy Thursday as “the day commemorating the institution of the priesthood” (*quo videlicet die institutio sacerdotii commemoratur*) and sends the reader to the Preface for the Chrism Mass of Holy Thursday for an explanation of the meaning of the office of the ministerial priesthood. The association of Holy Thursday with the institution of the ministerial priesthood is not part of the Church’s earlier traditions regarding this day. Rather, it was a day for reconciling public penitents, blessing oils, and commemorating the Lord’s Supper and the institution of the Eucharist. The Preface for the Chrism Mass was composed for *MR1970* to support the innovative practice of having all ordained priests renew their commitment to priestly service.¹⁵ Actually, the

15. See Kenneth Stevenson, *Jerusalem Revisited: The Liturgical Meaning of Holy Week* (Washington, DC: Pastoral Press, 1988), 42–43; also, J. Frank Henderson, “The Chrism Mass of Holy Thursday,” *Worship* 51 (1977): 149–158.

5. In addition, the nature of the ministerial priesthood also puts into its proper light another reality, which must indeed be highly regarded, namely, the royal priesthood of the faithful, whose spiritual sacrifice is brought to completeness through the ministry of the Bishop and the priests in union with the sacrifice of Christ, the one

5. Sed hac sacerdotii ministerialis naturae etiam aliud quiddam, magni sane faciendum, in sua luce collocatur, id est regale sacerdotium fidelium, quorum sacrificium spirituale per Episcopi et presbyterorum ministerium in unione cum sacrificio Christi, unici Mediatoris, consummatur.⁹ Namque celebratio Eucharistiae est actio

Preface puts the ordained priesthood within the context of the priesthood of Christ and the priesthood of the Church, but *IGMR2002* does not allude to this ecclesial context. Rather, in referring to the Preface, it focuses on the conferral of priestly power through the laying on of hands and notes that this power “is the continuation of the power of Christ the High Priest of the New Testament” (*est continuatio potestatis Christi, Summi Pontificis Novi Testamenti*).

5. The narrowly construed theology of the ordained ministry in no. 4 continues at the beginning of this article, which focuses on “the royal priesthood of the faithful” (*regale sacerdotium fidelium*), but says that this priesthood is put into its proper light by the nature of the ministerial priesthood. There is no mention of baptism as foundational for the Church’s ministry in this section. *PO*, no. 2, is given in a footnote to support the statement that the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful is brought to completion through the ministry of the bishop and priests. That is an accurate reference but the first part of *PO*, no. 2, which sets a context for the rest, has been ignored. *PO*, no. 2, begins with a statement that all who are part of Christ’s body share in his anointing and are made into a holy priesthood. Only then does the document move into a discussion of the ordained ministry. As in *IGMR2002*, no. 4, the ministry of the bishop has been added to that of the priests.

Although the starting point for this section on the priesthood of the faithful is clearly wanting, the document goes on to present the celebration of the Eucharist as the action of the whole Church. This principle is consistent with statements made in *SC*, nos. 7 and 26, but there are no references to this conciliar decree. This article presents the Church as “the People of God, purchased by Christ’s Blood, gathered together by the Lord, nourished by his word” (*populus Dei, Sanguine Christi acquisitus, a Domino congregatus, eius verbo nutritus*), but there is no reference to *LG*, no. 9, where this image for the Church was introduced at Vatican II. The document here recognizes that the Church is a people who give thanks in Christ by offering his sacrifice, that “it is a people made one by sharing in the Communion of Christ’s Body and Blood” (*populus denique, qui per Communionem Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in unum coalescit*). These statements provide the grounds for developing a rich eucharistic ecclesiology. The theme of holiness is associated with that of participation in the last sentence of this article, which suggests that this people “grows continually in holiness by its conscious, active, and fruitful participation in the mystery of the Eucharist”

and only Mediator.⁹ For the celebration of the Eucharist is an action of the whole Church, and in it each one should carry out solely but completely that which pertains to him or her, in virtue of the rank of each within the People of God. In this way greater consideration will also be given to some aspects of the celebration that have sometimes been accorded less attention in the course of time. For this people is the People of God, purchased by Christ's Blood, gathered together by the Lord, nourished by his word. It is a people called to bring to God the prayers of the entire human family, a people giving thanks in Christ for the mystery of salvation by offering his Sacrifice. Finally, it is a people made one by sharing in the Communion of Christ's Body and Blood. Though holy in its origin, this people nevertheless grows continually in holiness by its conscious, active, and fruitful participation in the mystery of the Eucharist.¹⁰

A Witness to Unbroken Tradition

6. In setting forth its instructions for the revision of the Order of Mass, the Second Vatican Council, using the same words as did St. Pius V in the Apostolic Constitution *Quo primum*, by which the Missal of Trent

*Ecclesiae universae; in qua unusquisque solum et totum id agat, quod ad ipsum pertinet, respectu habito gradus eius in populo Dei. Quo efficitur, ut etiam rationes quaedam celebrationis magis attendantur, quibus saeculorum decursu interdum est minor cura adhibita. Hic enim populus est populus Dei, Sanguine Christi acquisitus, a Domino congregatus, eius verbo nutritus, populus ad id vocatus, ut preces totius familiae humanae ad Deum admoveat, populus, qui pro mysterio salutis gratias in Christo agit eius sacrificium offerendo, populus denique, qui per Communionem Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in unum coalescit. Qui populus, licet origine sua sit sanctus, tamen per ipsam participationem consciam, actuosam et fructuosam mysterii eucharistici in sanctitate continenter crescit.*¹⁰

Traditio non intermissa declaratur

6. Cum praecipua enuntiaret, quibus Ordo Missae recognosceretur, Concilium Vaticanum II praeter alia mandavit quoque, ut ritus nonnulli restituerentur « ad pristinam sanctorum Patrum normam », ¹¹ iisdem

(*per ipsam participationem consciam, actuosam et fructuosam mysterii eucharistici in sanctitate continenter crescit*). It is odd that the footnote here is to SC, no. 11, rather than to SC, no. 14, which grounds liturgical participation in baptism or to SC, no. 10 which identifies liturgy as a source for sanctification.

The principle that the Eucharist is the action of the Church is a primary one that appears at the very beginning of Chapters I through V of *IGMR2002*. The significance of participation in the Eucharist will also permeate the document and the baptismal basis for this participation will be made clear (no. 18).

A Witness to Unbroken Tradition

6. The claim that the tradition has been unbroken can be misleading since *MR1969* incorporated significant changes from its predecessor. The tradition referenced in this section of the Preamble is that of the fathers of the Church. Number 6 creates a link between the Missal of 1570 (*MR1570*) and *MR1970* by

was promulgated in 1570, also ordered, among other things, that some rites be restored “to the original norm of the holy Fathers.”¹¹ From the fact that the same words are used it can be seen how both *Roman Missals*, although separated by four centuries, embrace one and the same tradition. Furthermore, if the inner elements of this tradition are reflected upon, it also becomes clear how outstandingly and felicitously the older *Roman Missal* is brought to fulfillment in the new.

7. In a difficult period when the Catholic faith on the sacrificial nature of the Mass, the ministerial priesthood, and the real and permanent presence of Christ under the Eucharistic species were placed at risk, St. Pius V was especially concerned with preserving the more recent tradition then unjustly being assailed, introducing only very slight changes into the sacred rite. In fact, the Missal of 1570 differs very little from the very first printed edition of 1474, which in turn faithfully follows the Missal used at the time of Pope Innocent III. Moreover, even though manuscripts in the Vatican Library provided material for the emendation of some expressions, they by no means made it possible to inquire into “ancient and approved authors” farther back than

videlicet usum verbis ac S. Pius V in Constitutione Apostolica « Quo primum » in scriptis, qua anno 1570 Missale Tridentinum est promulgatum. Ob hanc vero ipsam verborum convenientiam notari potest, qua ratione ambo Missalia romana, quamvis intercesserint quattuor sæcula, æqualem et parem complectantur traditionem. Si autem huius traditionis ponderentur interiora elementa, intellegitur etiam, quam egregie ac feliciter prius perficiatur altero.

7. Temporibus sane difficilibus, quibus catholica fides de indole sacrificali Missæ, de ministeriali sacerdotio, de reali et perpetua Christi sub eucharisticis speciebus præsentia in discrimen fuerat adducta, id S. Pii V imprimis intererat, ut recentiore traditionem, immerito oppugnatam, servaret, minimis tantummodo ritus sacri mutationibus inductis. Re quidem vera Missale illud anni 1570 paulum admodum distat a primo omnium anno 1474 typis edito Missali, quod vicissim fideliter quidem repetit Missale temporis Innocentii PP. III. Codices insuper Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ, quamquam aliquot intulerant locutionum emendationes, haud tamen permiserunt, ut in illa pervestigatione « veterum et probatorum auctorum » plus

saying that those who compiled both liturgical books had the same goal. It quotes SC, no. 50, which notes that the rites of the Mass are to be restored “to the original norm of the holy Fathers.” This was the same intention that had been articulated by Pius V (d. 1572) when he promulgated *MR1570*. His desire was to reform the rites of the Mass by returning to the tradition of the early Church although insufficient time and resources kept this goal from being fulfilled.¹⁶ This article suggests that this fulfillment can be found in *MR2002*.

7. This article provides a rationale for the fact that the goal of returning to the early traditions of the Church was not carried out in the *MR1570*. In addition to the lack of adequate sources in the Vatican Library, Pope Pius V was concerned with preserving the more recent tradition against attacks that were

16. See Robert Cabié, *History of the Mass*, trans. Lawrence J. Johnson (Beltsville: Pastoral Press, 1992) 88.

the liturgical commentaries of the Middle Ages.

8. Today, on the other hand, countless learned studies have shed light on the “norm of the holy Fathers” which the revisers of the Missal of St. Pius V followed. For following the publication first of the Sacramentary known as the Gregorian in 1571, critical editions of other ancient Roman and Ambrosian Sacramentaries were published, often in book form, as were ancient Hispanic and Gallican liturgical books which brought to light numerous prayers of no slight spiritual excellence that had previously been unknown.

In a similar fashion, traditions dating back to the first centuries, before the formation of the rites of East and West, are better known today because of the discovery of so many liturgical documents.

Moreover, continuing progress in the study of the holy Fathers has also shed light upon the theology of the mystery of the Eucharist through the teachings of such illustrious Fathers of Christian antiquity as St. Irenaeus, St. Ambrose, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. John Chrysostom.

quam liturgici commentarii mediæ ætatis inquirerentur.

8. Hodie, contra, illa « sanctorum Patrum norma », quam sectabantur Missalis S. Pii V emendatores, locupletata est innumerabilibus eruditorum scriptis. Postquam enim Sacramentarium Gregorianum nuncupatum anno 1571 primum editum est, vetera Sacramentaria romana et ambrosiana critica arte sæpe typis sunt divulgata, perinde ac vetusti libri liturgici hispani et gallicani, qui plurimas preces non levis præstantiæ spiritualis, eo usque ignoratas, in conspectum prodixerunt.

Traditiones pariter priscorum sæculorum, antequam ritus Orientis et Occidentis constituerentur, nunc idcirco melius cognoscuntur, quod tot reperta sunt documenta liturgica.

Præterea progredientia sanctorum Patrum studia theologiam mysterii eucharistici lumine perfuderunt doctrinæ Patrum in antiquitate christiana excellentissimum, uti S. Irenæi, S. Ambrosii, S. Cyrilli Hierosolymitani, S. Ioannis Chrysostomi.

being made at the time. As a result, *MR1570* did not depart in any radical way from the *MR1474*.¹⁷

8. This article explains why those who worked on *MR1970* were able to be more faithful to the goal of restoring the rites of the Mass to the “norm of the holy Fathers” (*sanctorum Patrum norma*). It recognizes the scholarly work that has been done in studying the theology of the Eucharist in the writings of such people as Irenaeus (d. ca. 200), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 387), Ambrose (d. 397), and John Chrysostom (d. 407). It notes the importance of the publication of critical editions of ancient sacramentaries and other liturgical books, which resulted in bringing to light “numerous prayers of no slight spiritual excellence that had previously been unknown” (*qui plurimas preces non levis præstantiæ spiritualis, eo usque ignoratas, in conspectum prodixerunt*). The Preamble calls attention to the fact that the discovery of ancient liturgical documents has given

17. For a summary of the kinds of changes that were made see Joseph A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, trans. Francis A. Brunner, 2 vols. (Westminster: Christian Classics, 1986) I:135–141; also, Mitchell and Baldwin, 18–22 above.

9. For this reason, the “norm of the holy Fathers” requires not only the preservation of what our immediate forebears have passed on to us, but also an understanding and a more profound study of the Church’s entire past and of all the ways in which her one and only faith has been set forth in the quite diverse human and social forms prevailing in the Semitic, Greek, and Latin areas. Moreover, this broader view allows us to see how the Holy Spirit endows the People of God with a marvelous fidelity in preserving the unalterable deposit of faith, even amid a very great variety of prayers and rites.

9. Quapropter « sanctorum Patrum norma » non postulat solum, ut conserventur ea, quæ maiores nostri proximi tradiderint, sed ut comprehendantur altiusque perpendantur cuncta præterita Ecclesiæ tempora ac modi universi, quibus unica eius fides declarata est in humani civilisque cultus formis tam inter se differentibus, quippe quæ vigerent in regionibus semiticis, græcis, latinis. Amplior autem hic prospectus cernere nos sinit, quemadmodum Spiritus Sanctus præstet populo Dei mirandam fidelitatem in conservando immutabili fidei deposito, licet permagna sit precum rituumque varietas.

Accommodation to New Conditions

10. The new Missal, therefore, while bearing witness to the Roman Church’s rule of prayer (*lex orandi*), also safeguards the deposit of faith handed down by the

Ad novas rerum condiciones accommodatio

10. Novum igitur Missale, dum testificatur legem orandi Ecclesiæ romanæ, fideique depositum a Conciliis recentioribus traditum tutatur, ipsum vicissim magni

us knowledge of “traditions dating back to the first centuries” (*Traditiones . . . priscorum saeculorum*). The use of the plural here is very significant. One of the richest consequences of the scholarly work done in the history of liturgy has been that of making available for the Church an awareness of the diversity of its traditions.

9. This article affirms our last point on no. 8 by making a very important statement about unity and diversity. It says that following the “norm of the holy Fathers” (*sanctorum Patrum norma*) includes the task of studying the diverse ways in which the faith of the Church has been set forth. This section of the Preamble ends by suggesting that an understanding of such diversity shows us “how the Holy Spirit endows the People of God with a marvelous fidelity in preserving the unalterable deposit of faith, even amid a very great variety of prayers and rites” (*quemadmodum Spiritus Sanctus præstet populo Dei mirandam fidelitatem in conservando immutabili fidei deposito, licet permagna sit precum rituumque varietas*). A focus on the goal shared by the revisers of the MR1570 and that of MR1970 to return to the “norm of the holy Fathers” has opened the door to diversity and provides a basis for the next section of the Preamble.

Accommodation to New Conditions

10. This final section of the Preamble begins with the indirect articulation of two important principles that will be operative in the rest of the section.

more recent Councils, and marks in its own right a step of great importance in liturgical tradition.

Indeed, when the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council reaffirmed the dogmatic pronouncements of the Council of Trent, they spoke at a far different time in world history, so that they were able to bring forward proposals and measures of a pastoral nature that could not have even been foreseen four centuries earlier.

11. The Council of Trent already recognized the great catechetical value contained in the celebration of Mass but was unable to bring out all its consequences in regard to actual practice. In fact, many were press-

momenti gradum designat in liturgica traditione.

Cum enim Patres Concilii Vaticani II asseverationes dogmaticas Concilii Tridentini iterarunt, in longe alia mundi ætate sunt locuti; qua de causa in re pastoralis valuerunt afferre proposita et consilia, quæ ante quattuor sæcula ne prævideri quidem potuerunt.

11. Agnoverat iam Tridentinum Concilium magnam utilitatem catechetica, quæ in Missæ celebratione contineretur; unde tamen colligere omnia consecraria, ad vitæ usum quod attinet, nequibat. A

Paragraph one states that the new Missal, “while bearing witness to the Roman Church’s rule of prayer, also safeguards the deposit of faith handed down by the more recent Councils, and marks in its own right a step of great importance in liturgical tradition” (*dum testificatur legem orandi Ecclesie romanae, fideique depositum a Conciliis recentioribus traditum tutatur, ipsum vicissim magni momenti gradum designat in liturgica traditione*). The implication here is that the Church’s liturgical tradition is a dynamic, living one, and that it can change. Although there are no footnotes to conciliar documents, this statement is in keeping with SC, no. 23, which recognizes the importance of both sound tradition and legitimate progress and notes that new forms should grow organically from already existing forms.

Paragraph 2 admits that when the bishops at Vatican II reaffirmed pronouncements of Trent, they were doing so at a very different time in history. As a result of this, they were able to make pastoral proposals that would not have been imagined in the sixteenth century. This is an implicit recognition of a significant principle of hermeneutics, namely, that the pronouncements of any council have to be understood within the historical, social, cultural, and theological context in which they are made (see Seasoltz, 39–40 and Power and Vincie, 93 above).

11. This and the following article address the topic of the vernacular. Number 11 illustrates the hermeneutical principle of contextualization in its explanation of why the Council of Trent did not give permission for the vernacular in celebrations of the Eucharist. The Preamble recognizes that many were requesting permission for the use of the vernacular but notes that the Council’s decision on this matter was made within a consideration of “the conditions of that age” (*adiunctorum illa ætate*). The Council of Trent’s statements regarding the use of the vernacular were made at Session 22 (1562). The main concern of the Council

ing for permission to use the vernacular in celebrating the Eucharistic Sacrifice; but the Council, weighing the conditions of that age, considered it a duty to answer this request with a reaffirmation of the Church's traditional teaching, according to which the Eucharistic Sacrifice is, first and foremost, the action of Christ himself, and therefore its proper efficacy is unaffected by the manner in which the faithful take part in it. The Council for this reason stated in firm but measured words, "Although the Mass contains much instruction for people of faith, nevertheless it did not seem expedient to the Fathers that it be celebrated everywhere in the vernacular."¹² The Council accordingly anathematized anyone maintaining that "the rite of the Roman Church, in which part of the Canon and the words of consecration are spoken in a low voice, is to be condemned, or that the Mass must be celebrated only in the

multis reapse flagitabatur, ut sermonem vulgarem in sacrificio eucharistico peragendo usurpari liceret. Ad talem quidem postulationem, Concilium, rationem ducens adiunctorum illa ætate obtinentium, sui officii esse arbitrabatur doctrinam Ecclesiæ tralaticiam denuo inculcare, secundum quam sacrificium eucharisticum imprimis Christi ipsius est actio, cuius proinde efficacitas propria eo modo non afficitur, quo fideles eiusdem fiunt participes. Idcirco firmis hisce simulque moderatis verbis edictum est: « Etsi Missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est Patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur ». ¹² Atque condemnandum esse pronuntiavit eum, qui censeret « Ecclesiæ romanæ ritum, quo submissa voce pars canonis et verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse; aut lingua tantum vulgari Missam celebrari debere ». ¹³ Nihilominus, dum hinc vetuit

during this session was to confirm Church doctrine regarding the sacrificial nature of the Mass against those reformers who challenged it. These same reformers were promoting the use of the vernacular. Robert Cabié has suggested that the "use of the vernacular was rejected solely in order that the Council might not seem to be crediting the reasons put forward by the Reformers to justify the vernacular."¹⁸

Article 11 of the Preamble quotes the conciliar statement of Trent that "although the Mass contains much instruction for people of faith, nevertheless it did not seem expedient to the Fathers that it be celebrated everywhere in the vernacular." The language of this statement, especially the use of the phrase "seem expedient" (*expedire visum est*) is very important. In his book *Dynamic Equivalence*, Keith Pecklers quotes an earlier version of this statement which was much more negative on the use of the vernacular.¹⁹ The Council of Trent did not condemn the use of the vernacular and this can be clearly seen in the

18. Robert Cabié, *The Eucharist*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell, Vol. II: *The Church at Prayer*, ed. A. G. Martimort (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1986), 174.

19. "The Latin language, too, which is used for the celebration of Mass in the Western Church, is in the highest degree appropriate, seeing that it is common to many nations. It seems beyond doubt that, were Mass to be carried out in each people's vulgar tongue, the divine Mysteries would be celebrated with less reverence. There would even be grave danger of various errors arising in many translations, with the result that the mysteries of our religion would differ, instead of being, as they are, one and unchanging." In Keith F. Pecklers, *Dynamic*

vernacular.”¹³ Although on the one hand it prohibited the use of the vernacular in the Mass, nevertheless, on the other hand, the Council did direct pastors of souls to put appropriate catechesis in its place: “Lest Christ’s flock go hungry . . . the Holy Synod commands pastors and all others having the care of souls to give frequent instructions during the celebration of Mass, either personally or through others, concerning what is read at Mass; among other things, they should include some explanation of the mystery of this most holy Sacrifice, especially on Sundays and holy days.”¹⁴

12. Therefore, when the Second Vatican Council convened in order to accommodate the Church to the requirements of her proper apostolic office precisely in these times, it examined thoroughly, as had Trent, the instructive and pastoral character

in Missa linguæ vernaculæ usum, illinc animarum pastores eius in locum congruentem substituere catechesim iussit: « ne oves Christi esuriant . . . mandat sancta Synodus pastoribus et singulis curam animarum gerentibus, ut frequenter inter Missarum celebrationem vel per se vel per alios, ex his, quæ in Missa leguntur, exponant atque inter cetera sanctissimi huius sacrificii mysterium aliquod declarent, diebus præsertim Dominicis et festis ».¹⁴

12. Propterea congregatum, ut Ecclesiam aptaret ad proprii muneris apostolici necessitates hisce ipsis temporibus, Concilium Vaticanum II funditus perspexit, quemadmodum Tridentinum, didascalicam et pastoralementem indolem sacræ Liturgiæ.¹⁵

canon quoted in the Preamble. The Council’s anathema was directed to those who held that the “Mass should only be celebrated in the vernacular” (*lingua tantum vulgari Missam celebrari debere*).²⁰ The inclusion of “only” (*tantum*) is very significant here. In light of the careful use of language in the statement of Trent, it is curious that the Preamble states that the Council “prohibited the use of the vernacular in the Mass” (*hinc vetuit in Missa linguæ vernaculæ usum*). The use of “prohibit” (*vetuit*) could easily be misunderstood and does not really convey what was actually said by the bishops at Trent.

The Preamble draws attention to the Council of Trent’s recognition of the catechetical value of the Mass within the context of its statements about the use of the vernacular. Although the Council decided that the use of the vernacular was not expedient at the time, it did express a pastoral concern for the people and indicated that instructions should be given during the Mass about the readings and other aspects of the mystery of the eucharistic sacrifice.

12. This article moves into a new historical context, that of the Second Vatican Council, but it creates a link with the Council of Trent by saying that both councils examined “the instructive and pastoral character of the Sacred Liturgy” (*didascalicam et pastoralementem indolem sacræ Liturgiæ*). This is supported by a

Equivalence: The Living Language of Christian Worship (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2003), 10.

20. See Council of Trent, Session 22, c. 9 in Tanner, 2:736. Footnote 13 of the Preamble is incorrect in referring to ch. 9 rather than c. 9.

of the Sacred Liturgy.¹⁵ Since no Catholic would now deny the lawfulness and efficacy of a sacred rite celebrated in Latin, the Council was also able to grant that “the use of the vernacular language may frequently be of great advantage to the people” and gave the faculty for its use.¹⁶ The enthusiasm in response to this measure has been so great everywhere that it has led, under the leadership of the Bishops and the Apostolic See itself, to permission for all liturgical celebrations in which the people participate to be in the vernacular, for the sake of a better comprehension of the mystery being celebrated.

Et, cum nemo catholicorum esset, qui legitimum efficacemque ritum sacrum negaret lingua latina peractum, concedere etiam valuit: « Haud raro linguæ vernaculæ usurpatio valde utilis apud populum existere possit », eiusque adhibendæ facultatem dedit.¹⁶ Flagrans illud studium, quo hoc consultum ubivis est susceptum, profecto effecit ut, ducibus Episcopis atque ipsa Apostolica Sede, universæ liturgicæ celebrationes quas populus participaret, exsequi liceret vulgari sermone, quo plenius intellexeretur mysterium, quod celebraretur.

footnote to SC, which states that “although the liturgy is above all things the worship of the divine majesty, it likewise contains rich instruction for the faithful” (no. 33). This conciliar statement is accompanied by a note to chapter 8 of Session 22 of the Council of Trent (1562), which made a similar statement about the instructive nature of the liturgy. The Preamble recognizes that, in this new context, people were not denying “the lawfulness and efficacy of a sacred rite celebrated in Latin” (*legitimum efficacemque ritum sacrum . . . lingua latina peractum*). This made it possible for Vatican II to grant a wider use of the vernacular. Article 12 goes on to note that the enthusiastic response to the use of the vernacular led “to permission for all liturgical celebrations in which the people participate to be in the vernacular, for the sake of a better comprehension of the mystery being celebrated” (*universæ liturgicæ celebrationes quas populus participaret, exsequi liceret vulgari sermone, quo plenius intellexeretur mysterium, quod celebraretur*).

Although the association made here between the vernacular and the people’s instruction or comprehension creates a link with the Council of Trent, it does not adequately reflect the Second Vatican Council’s understanding of the liturgy as ecclesial action (SC, nos. 26, 41 and 42) in which the faithful are called to “full, conscious, and active participation . . . by reason of their baptism” (SC, no. 14). In his 1965 remarks on the introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy, Pope Paul VI combined the goals of instruction and participation. He said that the use of the vernacular had been judged by the Church “to be necessary to make its prayer understandable and grasped by all. The good of the faithful calls for this kind of action, making possible their active share in the Church’s worship.” He went on to say to the people gathered in St. Peter’s Square, “that means you, the faithful, so that you may be able to unite yourselves more closely to the Church’s prayer, pass over from being simply spectators to becoming

13. Indeed, since the use of the vernacular in the Sacred Liturgy may certainly be considered an important means for presenting more clearly the catechesis regarding the mystery that is inherent in the celebration itself, the Second Vatican Council also ordered that certain prescriptions of the Council of Trent that had not been followed everywhere be brought to fruition, such as the homily to be given on Sundays and holy days¹⁷ and the faculty to interject certain explanations during the sacred rites themselves.¹⁸

13. Verumtamen, cum linguae vernaculae usus in sacra Liturgia instrumentum sit, quamvis magni momenti, quo apertius exprimeretur catechesis mysterii, quae in celebratione continetur, Concilium Vaticanum II admonuit praeterea, ut aliqua Tridentini praescripta, quibus non omnibus locis erat obtemperatum, ad exitum deducerentur, veluti homilia diebus dominicis et festis habenda¹⁷ et facultas inter ipsos sacros ritus quasdam monitiones intericiendi.¹⁸

active participants.”²¹ This combination of reasons—increased participation and better understanding—provided the rationale for the expansion of the use of the vernacular in the second instruction for implementing SC that was issued in 1967.²² *IGMR2002* has several new references to the vernacular in Chapter IX which has been added to the document.²³

13. Both paragraphs of this article place the prescriptions of the Second Vatican Council in continuity with the Council of Trent. Paragraph one returns to the concern for the catechetical nature of the liturgy, introduced in conjunction with the vernacular. It notes that the bishops at Vatican II realized that the prescriptions set out by the bishops at the Council of Trent regarding the giving of homilies and the offering of explanations had often not been followed. Therefore, Vatican II brought Trent “to fruition” (*ad exitum*) by instructing that a homily should be given on Sundays and holy days (SC, no. 52) and providing for the possibility of brief comments during the liturgy (SC, no. 35.3). The homily and explanations, obviously to be given in the vernacular, are intended as means “for presenting more clearly the catechesis regarding the mystery that is inherent in the celebration itself” (*quo apertius exprimeretur catechesis mysterii, quae in celebratione continetur*).

The understanding of catechesis suggested here is one that seems to go beyond the notion of mere instruction. *IGMR2002* would have been enriched by referencing the *Directorium generale pro catechesi* issued in 1997 which presents the catechesis associated with Christian initiation as a formation in the faith that “includes more than instruction: it is an apprenticeship of the entire Christian life” (no. 67). The Directory quotes *Catechesi Tradendae* in presenting the

21. Paul VI, “Remarks at the Angelus to the people in St. Peter’s Square, on the beginning of the vernacular in the liturgy,” 7 March 1965, in DOL, no. 399.

22. SC Rites (Consilium), “Instruction (second) *Tres abhinc annos*, on the orderly carrying out of the Constitution on the Liturgy,” 4 May 1967, in DOL, nos. 445 and 474.

23. E.g., nos. 389, 391 and 392.

Above all, the Second Vatican Council, which urged "that more perfect form of participation in the Mass by which the faithful, after the priest's Communion, receive the Lord's Body from the same Sacrifice,"¹⁹ called for another desire of the Fathers of Trent to be realized, namely that for the sake of a fuller participation in the holy Eucharist "the faithful present at each Mass should communicate not only by spiritual desire but also by sacramental reception of the Eucharist."²⁰

Potissimum vero Concilium Vaticanum II, a quo suadebatur « illa perfectior Missae participatio, qua fideles post Communionem sacerdotis ex eodem sacrificio Corpus dominicum sumunt », ¹⁹ incitavit, ut aliud optatum Patrum Tridentinorum in rem transferretur, ut scilicet ad sacram Eucharistiam plenius participandam « in singulis Missis fideles adstantes non solum spirituali affectu, sed sacramentali etiam Eucharistiae perceptione communicarent ».²⁰

aim of catechesis as that of putting people "in communion and intimacy with Jesus Christ" (no. 80). The catechetical nature of the liturgy is treated explicitly or implicitly elsewhere in *IGMR2002*. For example, no. 28 recognizes that the faithful are instructed and refreshed at the table of God's Word and Christ's Body. Also, no. 65 identifies the homily as "part of the Liturgy" (*pars Liturgiae*) and as "necessary for the nurturing of the Christian life" (*ad nutrimentum vitae christianae necessaria*).

Paragraph two of no. 13 is concerned with participation in the Mass through sacramental reception of the Eucharist. Once again, the Second Vatican Council is presented as the fulfillment of something expressed at the Council of Trent. Chapter six of session 22 (1562) of that Council is quoted as indicating the desire that "the faithful present at each Mass should communicate not only by spiritual desire but also by sacramental reception of the Eucharist" (*in singulis Missis fideles adstantes non solum spirituali affectu, sed sacramentali etiam Eucharistiae perceptione communicarent*). While chapter six of session 22 begins with this affirmation, the concern of the chapter is not the promotion of sacramental reception of the Eucharist. Rather, it is a defense of Masses in which only the priest communicated over against those who wished such Masses to be condemned. In a new historical context, Vatican II could promote what is stated in *SC*, no. 55 and quoted here as "that more perfect form of participation in the Mass by which the faithful, after the priest's Communion, receive the Lord's Body from the same Sacrifice" (*illa perfectior Missae participatio, qua fideles post Communionem sacerdotis ex eodem sacrificio Corpus dominicum sumunt*).

In stating that the faithful should "receive the Lord's Body from the same Sacrifice," the bishops were not only reaffirming the importance of sacramental reception of the Eucharist. They were setting out a very important principle about the meaning of participation in the celebration of the Eucharist that went beyond what was articulated by the Council of Trent. That this principle has not been well received is evident in the many parishes where Holy Communion comes from the tabernacle rather than the table of the Lord. The principle will be repeated in *IGMR2002*, no. 85, and the reason given there is "that even by

14. Moved by the same desire and pastoral concern, the Second Vatican Council was able to give renewed consideration to what was established by Trent on Communion under both kinds. And indeed, since no one today calls into doubt in any way the doctrinal principles on the complete efficacy of Eucharistic Communion under the species of bread alone, the Council thus gave permission for the reception of Communion under both kinds on some occasions, because this clearer form of the sacramental sign offers a particular opportunity of deepening the understanding of the mystery in which the faithful take part.²¹

14. Eodem quidem animo ac studio pastorali permotum, Concilium Vaticanum II nova ratione expendere potuit institutum Tridentinum de Communionem sub utraque specie. Etenim, quoniam hodie in dubium minime revocantur doctrinae principia de plenissima vi Communionis, qua Eucharistia sub una specie panis suscipitur, permisit interdum Communionem sub utraque specie, cum scilicet, per dilucidio-rem signi sacramentalis formam, opportunitas peculiaris offerretur altius intellegendi mysterii, quod fideles participant.²¹

means of the signs Communion will stand out more clearly as a participation in the sacrifice actually being celebrated" (*quo etiam per signa Communionem melius appareat participatio sacrificii, quod actu celebratur*). The theological significance of this principle is that it reconnects the two dimensions of sacrifice and meal in the celebration of the Eucharist.²⁴

14. The focus of this article is Communion under both kinds. Once again, there is a concerted effort to make a link with the Council of Trent in order to show that the permission given by Vatican II for the reception of Communion under both kinds on some occasions was not in contradiction with the principles set out by Trent. The link is made by saying that both the bishops at Trent and those at Vatican II were "moved by the same desire and pastoral concern" (*Eodem quidem animo ac studio pastorali permotum*). The difference between the two councils is a difference, once again, of context. Whereas the bishops at Trent were in a defensive posture against persons who questioned the efficacy of reception of Communion under the species of bread alone, this was not part of the context for the bishops at Vatican II.

Article 14 notes that permission was given at Vatican II for Communion under both kinds on some occasions, "because this clearer form of the sacramental sign offers a particular opportunity of deepening the understanding of the mystery in which the faithful partake" (*per dilucidio-rem signi sacramentalis formam, opportunitas peculiaris offerretur altius intellegendi mysterii, quod fideles participant*). There is a footnote to SC, no. 55, which does allow for the possibility for Communion under both kinds after a clear statement about the dogmatic principles of Trent being intact. However, nothing is said about the sign value of the action. *Eucharisticum Mysterium*, no. 32, did state that "holy communion has a more complete form as a sign when it is received under both

24. See Irwin, 231–233.

15. In this manner the Church, while remaining faithful to her office as teacher of truth safeguarding “things old,” that is, the deposit of tradition, fulfills at the same time another duty, that of examining and prudently bringing forth “things new” (cf. Mt 13:52).

Accordingly, a part of the new Missal directs the prayers of the Church in a more open way to the needs of our times, which is above all true of the Ritual Masses and the Masses for Various Needs, in which tradition and new elements are appropriately harmonized. Thus, while many expressions, drawn from the Church’s most ancient tradition and familiar through the

15. Hoc pacto, dum fida permanet Ecclesia suo muneri ut magistræ veritatis, custodiens « vetera », id est depositum traditionis, officium quoque explet considerandi prudenterque adhibendi « nova » (cf. Mt 13, 52).

Pars enim quædam novi Missalis preces Ecclesiæ apertius ordinat ad temporis nostri necessitates; cuius generis sunt potissimum Missæ rituales et pro variis necessitatibus, in quibus traditio et novitas opportune inter se sociantur. Itaque, dum complures dictiones integræ manserunt ex antiquissima haustæ Ecclesiæ traditione, per ipsum sæpius editum Missale Romanum patefacta, alia plures ad hodierna

forms,” and this document is referenced in no. 281 below, where there is an elaboration of the sign value of Communion under both kinds.

15. This article returns to the image of a living tradition that was introduced at the beginning of the Preamble. The first paragraph suggests that the Church has the twofold task of “safeguarding ‘things old,’ that is, the deposit of tradition” and “prudently bringing forth ‘things new’” (*custodiens “vetera”, id est depositum traditionis . . . prudenterque adhibendi “nova”*). This serves as background for paragraph two, which introduces the Ritual Masses and Masses for Various Needs that are part of the new Missal. The Preamble notes that, in the prayers of these Masses, the Church is responding to the needs of our times and bringing tradition and new elements into harmony. It indicates that this happens because the prayers of these Masses include ancient expressions that have not been changed as well as those that “have been accommodated to today’s needs and circumstances” (*ad hodierna requisita et condiciones accommodatae sunt*). Here we have the link with tradition, but the Preamble goes on to note that some of the prayers have been newly composed, including those that are related to “certain needs proper to our era” (*necessitatibus quibusdam nostrae aetatis propriis*). Here *IGMR2002* recognizes the dynamic nature of liturgical prayer, because it is the prayer of a living Church. This continues in paragraph three, which notes that some phrases of the ancient texts have been changed “so that the style of language would be more in accord with the language of modern theology and would truly reflect the current discipline of the Church” (*quo convenientius sermo ipse cum hodiernae theologiae lingua concineret referretque ex veritate condicionem disciplinae Ecclesiae praesentem*).

Although there are no notes to conciliar documents, the Preamble indicates that the thoughts and even phrasing of recent documents of the Council have been influential in the composition of new prayers and the adaptations made

many editions of the *Roman Missal*, have remained unchanged, many other expressions have been accommodated to today's needs and circumstances. Still others, such as the prayers for the Church, the laity, the sanctification of human work, the community of all peoples, and certain needs proper to our era, have been newly composed, drawing on the thoughts and often the very phrasing of the recent documents of the Council.

Moreover, on account of the same attitude toward the new state of the present world, it seemed that in the use of texts from the most ancient tradition, so revered a treasure would in no way be harmed if some phrases were changed so that the style of language would be more in accord with the language of modern theology and would truly reflect the current discipline of the Church. Thus, not a few expressions bearing on the evaluation and use of goods of the earth have been changed, as have also not a few allusions to a certain form of outward penance belonging to past ages of the Church.

requisita et condiciones accommodatæ sunt, aliæ, contra, uti orationes pro Ecclesia, laicis, operis humani sanctificatione, omnium gentium communitate, necessitatibus quibusdam nostræ ætatis propriis, ex integro sunt contextæ, sumptis cogitationibus ac sæpe ipsis locutionibus ex recentibus Concilii documentis.

Ob eandem porro æstimationem novi status mundi, qui nunc est, in vetustissimæ traditionis textuum usu, nulla prorsus videbatur inferri iniuria tam venerando thesauro, si quædam sententiæ immutarentur, quo convenientius sermo ipse cum hodiernæ theologiæ lingua concineret referretque ex veritate condicionem disciplinæ Ecclesiæ præsentem. Hinc dicta nonnulla, ad existimationem et usum bonorum terrestrium attentia, sunt mutata, haud secus ac nonnulla, quæ exterioris quandam pænitentiae formam probebant aliarum Ecclesiæ ætatum propriam.

Hoc denique modo normæ liturgicæ Concilii Tridentini pluribus sane in partibus completæ et perfectæ sunt normis Concilii Vaticani II, quod ad exitum per-

to the old. Several possible references come to mind. *SC*, no. 2, presents the liturgy as an action in which the Church is disclosed. *LG*, no. 48, provides us with the image of a pilgrim Church, a Church moving forward to the new heavens and the new earth, but belonging to the present age. Finally, *GS*, no. 1, begins with the memorable statement that "the joys and hopes, the struggle and grief and anguish of the people of our time, especially of those who are poor or afflicted, are the joys and hopes, the grief and anguish of the followers of Christ as well. Nothing that is genuinely human fails to find an echo in their hearts." Surely such passages provide a foundation for thinking of the liturgy as a living tradition that can repeat and modify the old as well as incorporate the new.

The Preamble comes to a close by emphasizing continuity with the Council of Trent by stating that its liturgical norms "have certainly been completed and perfected in many respects by those of the Second Vatican Council" (*sane in partibus completæ et perfectæ sunt normis Concilii Vaticani II*). The norms set out by Vatican II have realized the goal of bringing "the faithful closer to the Sacred Liturgy" (*ad sacram Liturgiam fideles propius*). Thus, the Preamble ends by highlighting the pastoral concern that has been evident in many of its statements and will reappear in numerous ways throughout the rest of *IGMR2002*.

Finally, in this manner the liturgical norms of the Council of Trent have certainly been completed and perfected in many respects by those of the Second Vatican Council, which has brought to realization the efforts of the last four hundred years to bring the faithful closer to the Sacred Liturgy especially in recent times, and above all the zeal for the Liturgy promoted by St. Pius X and his successors.

duxit conatus ad sacram Liturgiam fideles propius admovendi, qui per hæc quattuor sæcula sunt suscepti, præsertim vero recentiore ætate, maxime studio rei liturgicæ a S. Pio X eiusque Successoribus promoti.

GIRM—Notes (English)

1. Ecumenical Council of Trent, Session 22, *Doctrina de ss. Missæ sacrificio*, 17 September 1562: *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, H. Denzinger and A. Schönmetzer, editors (editio XXXIII, Freiburg: Herder, 1965; hereafter, Denz-Schön), 1738–1759.

2. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 47; cf. Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen gentium*, nos. 3, 28; Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, nos. 2, 4, 5.

3. Evening Mass of the Lord's Supper, prayer over the offerings. Cf. *Sacramentarium Veronense*, L.C. Mohlberg et al., editors (3rd edition, Rome, 1978), section I, no. 93.

4. Cf. Eucharistic Prayer III.

5. Cf. Eucharistic Prayer IV.

6. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, nos. 7, 47; Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, nos. 5, 18.

7. Cf. Pius XII, Encyclical Letter *Humani generis*, 12 August 1950: *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*, Commentarium Officiale (Vatican City; hereafter, AAS), 42 (1950), pp. 570–571; Paul VI, Encyclical Letter *Mysterium fidei*, On the doctrine and worship of the Eucharist, 3 September 1965: AAS 57(1965), pp. 762–769; Paul VI, Solemn Profession of Faith, 30 June 1968, nos. 24–26: AAS 60 (1968), pp. 442–443; Sacred Congregation of Rites, Instruction *Eucharisticum mysterium*, On the worship of the Eucharist, 25 May 1967, nos. 3f, 9: AAS 59 (1967), pp. 543, 547.

IGMR—Notes (Latin)

1. CONC. ŒCUM. TRID., Sessio XXII, 17 septembris 1562: Denz.-Schönm. 1738–1759.

2. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 47; cf. Const. dogm. de Ecclesia, *Lumen gentium*, nn. 3, 28; Decr. de Presbyterorum ministerio et vita, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, nn. 2, 4, 5.

3. Missa vespertina in Cena Domini, oratio super oblata. Cf. *Sacramentarium Veronense*, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, n. 93.

4. Cf. Prex eucharistica III.

5. Cf. Prex eucharistica IV.

6. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, nn. 7, 47; Decr. de Presbyterorum ministerio et vita, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, nn. 5, 18.

7. Cf. PIUS XII, Litt. Enc. *Humani generis*, diei 12 augusti 1950: A.A.S. 42 (1950) pp. 570–571; PAULUS VI, Litt. Enc. *Mysterium Fidei*, diei 3 septembris 1965: A.A.S. 57 (1965) pp. 762–769; *Sollemnis professio fidei*, diei 30 iunii 1968, nn. 24–26: A.A.S. 60 (1968) pp. 442–443; S. CONGR. RITUUM, Instr. *Eucharisticum mysterium*, diei 25 maii 1967, nn. 3 f, 9: A.A.S. 59 (1967) pp. 543, 547.

8. Cf. Council of Trent, session 13, *Decretum de ss. Eucharistia*, 11 October 1551: Denz-Schön, 1635–1661.

9. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, no. 2.

10. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 11.

11. *Ibid.*, no. 50.

12. Ecumenical Council of Trent, Session 22, *Doctrina de ss. Missae sacrificio*, 17 September 1562, chapter 8: Denz-Schön, 1749.

13. *Ibid.*, chap. 9: Denz-Schön, 1759.

14. *Ibid.*, chap. 8: Denz-Schön, 1749.

15. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 33.

16. *Ibid.*, no. 36.

17. *Ibid.*, no. 52.

18. *Ibid.*, no. 35:3.

19. *Ibid.*, no. 55.

20. Ecumenical Council of Trent, Session 22, *Doctrina de ss. Missae sacrificio*, 17 September 1562, chapter 6: Denz-Schön, 1747.

21. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 55.

8. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. TRID., Sessio XIII, 11 octobris 1551: Denz.-Schönm. 1635–1661.

9. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Decr. de Presbyterorum ministerio et vita, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, n. 2.

10. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 11.

11. *Ibidem*, n. 50.

12. CONC. ŒCUM. TRID., Sessio XXII, Doctr. de ss. Missæ sacrificio, cap. 8: Denz.-Schönm. 1749.

13. *Ibidem*, can. 9: Denz.-Schönm. 1759.

14. *Ibidem*, cap. 8: Denz.-Schönm. 1749.

15. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 33.

16. *Ibidem*, n. 36.

17. *Ibidem*, n. 52.

18. *Ibidem*, n. 35, 3.

19. *Ibidem*, n. 55.

20. CONC. ŒCUM. TRID., Sessio XXII, Doctr. de ss. Missæ sacrificio, cap. 6: Denz-Schönm. 1747.

21. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 55.

CHAPTER I

Importance and Dignity of the Eucharistic Celebration

*(DE CELEBRATIONIS EUCHARISTICÆ
MOMENTO ET DIGNITATE)*

Keith F. Pecklers

Introduction

Chapter I is an amplified version of what appears in the 1975 *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (IGMR1975) and the first six articles (nos. 16–21) are essentially a repetition of what is found in the former Instruction. This introductory chapter discusses the eucharistic celebration in general terms, establishing the framework for particular aspects of the liturgical action that will be treated in subsequent chapters. While emphasizing the hierarchical nature of the Church’s worship, active participation is strongly affirmed both as a right and duty of all Christians by virtue of their baptism. The eucharistic celebration is the heart of the Christian life and the source and summit of all its activity (*Sacrosanctum Concilium* [SC], no. 10; *Catholicae Ecclesiae Catechismus* [CEC], no. 1071). In *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* Pope John Paul II (d. 2005) called it “the most precious possession which the Church can have in her journey through history” (no. 9). Thus, the better the active participation of the liturgical assembly, the more is the ecclesial nature of that celebration revealed.

Articles 22–26 offer new material, which focuses largely on the diocesan bishop as the chief liturgist of the diocese (see no. 387 below; also cf. Mitchell and Baldovin, 11 and Seasoltz, 33 above). It is the bishop’s role to promote and safeguard the dignity of proper celebration according to the local norms established by the conference of bishops. Eucharistic celebrations presided over by the bishop should be examples for the entire diocese of beauty in the arrangement of the liturgical space, tasteful use of art and sacred music. Here, particular aspects of adaptation and issues of translation are discussed, although those topics will be treated in much greater detail later in the Instruction.

Chapter I

THE IMPORTANCE AND DIGNITY OF
THE EUCHARISTIC CELEBRATION

16. The celebration of Mass, as the action of Christ and the People of God arrayed hierarchically, is the center of the whole Christian life for the Church both universal and local, as well as for each of the faithful individually.²² In it is found the high point both of the action by which God sanctifies the world in Christ and of the worship that the human race offers to the Father, adoring him through Christ, the Son of God, in the Holy Spirit.²³ In it, moreover, during the course of the year, the mysteries of redemp-

Caput I

DE CELEBRATIONIS EUCHARIS-
TICÆ MOMENTO ET DIGNITATE

16. Celebratio Missæ, ut actio Christi et populi Dei hierarchice ordinati, centrum est totius vitæ christianæ pro Ecclesia tum universa tum locali, ac pro singulis fidelibus.²² In ea enim culmen habetur et actionis qua Deus in Christo mundum sanctificat, et cultus quem homines exhibent Patri, eum per Christum Dei Filium in Spiritu Sancto adorantes.²³ In ea insuper mysteria redemptionis ita per anni circulum recoluntur, ut quodammodo præsentia reddantur.²⁴ Ceteræ autem actiones sacræ

16. Article 16 emphasizes the ecclesial nature of the eucharistic celebration as the action of Christ and the whole Church as it gathers liturgically in hierarchical order (SC, no. 41; *Lumen Gentium* [LG], no. 11; *Christus Dominus* [ChrDom], no. 30; *Eucharisticum Dominum*, no. 30; CEC, nos. 1136 and 1140). The entire Christian community functions as celebrants in the sacred liturgy, albeit with different roles and functions (CEC, no. 1142; also Power and Vincie, 51 above). The Mass is the culmination of the Christian life; the liturgical assembly worships God through Christ in the Holy Spirit; God sanctifies the Church through Christ's action and strengthens it for its mission within the world (SC, no. 10; *Ad Gentes* [AG], nos. 6, 9, and 36; CEC, no. 1072). Throughout the liturgical year the Eucharist recalls the various mysteries of our redemption and those mysteries are made present in word and sacrament. In this way all of the other rites of the Church have their origins in the eucharistic celebration, as does the daily living out of the Gospel itself (*Presbyterorum Ordinis* [PO], no. 5).

In this first article one hears resonances of the two groundbreaking encyclicals of Pius XII (d. 1958): *Mystici Corporis* (1943) and *Mediator Dei* (1947). *Mystici Corporis* reawakened the Church to the fundamentally Pauline and Augustinian theology of the organic unity within Christ's body, which has the Eucharist at its heart. The doctrine of the Church as the mystical body of Christ was first recovered by nineteenth-century theologians at Tübingen and provided the theological foundations for the liturgical movement in the early twentieth century. In promoting a liturgical vision that linked together Christian worship with the Church's mission in the world, pioneers of that movement found a solid foundation for their efforts in the theology of the mystical body.

Mediator Dei was the first major encyclical on the subject of the liturgy, and the ecclesiological dimension of worship found in no. 16 is clearly articulated in that preconciliar papal document. We read: "Christ acts each day to save us,

tion are recalled so as in some way to be made present.²⁴ Furthermore, the other sacred actions and all the activities of the Christian life are bound up with it, flow from it, and are ordered to it.²⁵

17. It is therefore of the greatest importance that the celebration of the Mass—that is, the Lord’s Supper—be so arranged that the sacred ministers and the faithful taking part in it, according to the proper state of each, may derive from it more abundantly²⁶ those fruits for the sake of which Christ the Lord instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice of his Body and Blood and entrusted it to the Church, his beloved Bride, as the memorial of his Passion and Resurrection.²⁷

et omnia opera christianæ vitæ cum ea coherent, ex ea profluunt et ad eam ordinantur.²⁵

17. Maxime proinde interest ut celebratio Missæ seu Cenæ dominicæ ita ordinetur, ut sacri ministri atque fideles, illam pro sua condicione participant, eos fructus plenius exinde capiant,²⁶ ad quos obtinendos Christus Dominus sacrificium eucharisticum sui Corporis et sui Sanguinis instituit illudque, velut memoriale passionis et resurrectionis suæ, Ecclesiæ dilectæ sponsæ concredidit.²⁷

in the sacraments and in His holy sacrifice. . . Not from any ability of our own, but from the power of God, are they endowed with the capacity to unite the piety of members with that of the Head, and to make this, in a sense, the action of the whole community” (no. 29).

Article 16 cites SC to emphasize the important role that all members of the Church have as they are united together in Christ’s action. Number 10 of that Constitution refers to the liturgy as “the summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed; it is also the source from which all its power flows.” Consequently, those who have been baptized into Christ “should come together to praise God in the midst of his Church, to take part in the sacrifice, and to eat the Lord’s supper.”

Throughout the liturgical year, even as various aspects of the mysteries of Christ’s life are recalled in different eucharistic celebrations (*CEC*, nos. 1163–1165 and 1168–1170), it is nonetheless the same paschal mystery of Jesus Christ that is celebrated (*CEC*, nos. 1171 and 1172–1174). Strengthened at the table of the Word and the table of Eucharist, Christians are sent forth to serve the Body of Christ beyond the confines of the church buildings (see *Mane Nobiscum Domine*, no. 13). And it is to that eucharistic assembly they will return, offering back to God their lives and the mission of the Church in which they have been engaged during the previous week.

17. The diversity of ministries within the liturgical assembly is highlighted here. In the Mass, each participant assumes his or her proper liturgical role for an effective celebration (*SC*, nos. 14, 19, 26, 28 and 30). The specifics of these roles will be presented and discussed later in the Instruction (e.g., see nos. 95–97 below), but their importance is affirmed here from the outset. This recovery of baptism as foundational for all liturgical ministry was a radical change from Tridentine worship, which left very little room for lay participation in the

18. This will best be accomplished if, with due regard for the nature and the particular circumstances of each liturgical assembly, the entire celebration is planned in such a way that it leads to a conscious, active, and full participation of the faithful both in body and in mind, a participation burning with faith, hope, and charity, of the sort which is desired by the Church and demanded by the very nature of the celebration, and to which the Christian people have a right and duty by reason of their Baptism.²⁸

18. Quod apte fiet si, attentis natura alisque adiunctis uniuscuiusque cœtus liturgici, universa celebratio ita disponatur, ut consciam illam, actuosam atque plenam participationem fidelium inducat, corporis nempe et animi, fide, spe et caritate ferventem, quæ ab Ecclesia exoptatur et ab ipsa celebrationis natura postulatur, et ad quam populus christianus vi baptismatis ius habet et officium.²⁸

Eucharist. Such recovery was one of the greatest accomplishments at Vatican II. We read in SC, no. 14, "It is very much the wish of the church that all the faithful should be led to take that full, conscious and active part in liturgical celebration which is demanded by the nature of the liturgy, and to which the Christian people, 'a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people' (1 Pet. 2:9, 4-5) have a right and to which they are bound by reason of their Baptism." SC further states that full and active participation of Christians gathered together in worship must be the goal to be pursued above all else. SC then quotes from Pius X's (d. 1914) 1903 *motu proprio, Tra le sollecitudini*, which some consider the *Magna Carta* of the liturgical movement, since it defined the liturgy as the "primary, indeed the indispensable source from which the faithful are to derive the true Christian spirit" (SC, no. 14). The Eucharist was instituted by Christ himself and entrusted by Christ himself to the Church as a memorial of his passion and death. Consequently, participation in that eucharistic sacrifice by the entire People of God is essential (SC, no. 47).

18. Here *IGMR2002* gives further attention to the importance of "conscious, active, and full participation" in the eucharistic celebration, suggesting how this participation will come about. First, careful attention will need to be given to the "nature and circumstances of each liturgical assembly." In other words, the context of the particular worshipping community is always significant since it should determine in what manner the liturgy is celebrated so that the faithful's participation is both facilitated and encouraged. This is especially true in liturgical preaching where the homily necessarily must address the problems and issues within that particular community in light of the biblical readings assigned to that day (see nos. 65–66 below). This theme will be further developed in Chapter IX as *IGMR2002* treats the subject of adaptation and liturgical inculturation (see Francis-Neville, 448 below). In the post-Vatican II Church it has become abundantly clear that pastoral situations around the world are quite diverse and the eucharistic celebration needs to be planned and celebrated in such a way that it manifests the particular community that celebrates.

19. Even if it is sometimes not possible to have the presence and active participation of the faithful, which bring out more plainly the ecclesial nature of the celebration,²⁹ the Eucharistic Celebration always retains its efficacy and dignity because it is the action of Christ and the Church, in which the priest fulfills his own principal office and always acts for the people's salvation.

19. Quamvis fidelium praesentia et actiosa participatio, quae ecclesialem celebrationis naturam apertius manifestant,²⁹ aliquando non possint haberi, eucharistica celebratio sua efficacia et dignitate semper est praedita, quippe quae sit actus Christi et Ecclesiae, in quo sacerdos munus suum praecipuum adimplet et semper agit pro salute populi.

A second aspect mentioned is that of proper liturgical planning so as to bring about the participation desired by the Council. This planning necessarily includes attention to liturgical catechesis so that communities are taught the importance of participating both "in body and spirit." This goes beyond emphasizing the importance of singing the hymns and responses, praying aloud the spoken prayer texts along with the rest of the assembly. It also includes attention to the link between eucharistic participation and daily life, and what the assembly's eucharistic "Amen" signifies as it lives out its liturgical participation during the week. Many Roman Catholics do not understand the mutuality between *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* and hence do not recognize the formative character of the eucharistic liturgy (CEC, no. 1124). Greater attention to liturgical preaching and liturgical catechesis will assist the faithful to enter more deeply into the mystery of the Eucharist and live the liturgy more intentionally in daily life (CEC, nos. 1074 and 1075).

Full and active eucharistic participation is motivated by the evangelical virtues of faith, hope, and charity. Catholics do not worship in a vacuum but are bound together with others both in their particular local community and with the Church throughout the world. CEC clearly states, "In the New Testament the word 'liturgy' refers not only to the celebration of divine worship but also to the proclamation of the Gospel and to active charity" (no. 1070). The third century *Didascalia Apostolorum* admonished bishops to give careful attention to the way in which they showed hospitality within the liturgical assembly—how they welcomed the poor and needy, the elderly and foreigners.¹ Today it is more important than ever that our liturgical participation be motivated not only by faith and hope but also by charity, expressed most immediately in the way we welcome those on our left and right in the liturgical assembly and how that eucharistic charity is lived beyond the walls of the church building (SC, no. 14; AG, no. 36).

19. IGMR2002 asserts that the combination of the liturgical assembly's presence and its active participation most fully highlights the ecclesial nature of the

1. 12 (2.57) in F.X. Funk, ed., *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum I* (Paderborn, 1905), 158–167.

It is therefore recommended that the priest celebrate the Eucharistic Sacrifice even daily, if possible.³⁰

20. Because, however, the celebration of the Eucharist, like the entire Liturgy, is carried out through perceptible signs that nourish, strengthen, and express faith,³¹ the utmost care must be taken to choose and to arrange those forms and elements set forth by the Church that, in view of the circumstances of the people and the place, will more effectively foster active and full

*Ipsi ergo commendatur ut sacrificium eucharisticum etiam cotidie, pro posse, celebret.*³⁰

20. *Cum autem Eucharistiae celebratio, sicut et universa Liturgia, fiat per signa sensibilia, quibus fides alitur, roboratur et exprimitur,*³¹ *maxime curandum est eas formas et elementa ab Ecclesia proposita seligi et ordinari, quae, attentis personarum et locorum adiunctis, actuosam et plenam participationem intensius foveant et fidelium utilitati spirituali aptius respondeant.*

Church. As the community gathers together to hear God's Word and be nourished by the Eucharist, the Eucharist should be at the heart of the Christian life (cf. *Mane Nobiscum Domini*, no. 17). While the celebration of Mass with the presence of the liturgical assembly is always normative (SC, no. 41; *Codex Iuris Canonici* 1983 [CIC1983], c. 837, par. 1; CEC, no. 1140), the eucharistic celebration is never diminished even when it is not possible for the lay faithful to be present. This is so because the liturgical action itself belongs to Christ and the Church, and the priest carries out his office in the name of Christ and the Church even in those exceptional situations when the faithful are not present. What is new in this section is the recommendation that the priest should celebrate the Eucharist "even daily whenever possible" (PO, no. 13). This is a repetition of what is stated in CIC1983 (c. 904). *Codex Iuris Canonici* 1917 (CIC1917) required priests to celebrate Mass several times a year but also directed bishops and religious superiors to encourage their priests in celebrating the Eucharist at least on Sundays (CIC1917, c. 805). Canon 904 does not retain the obligatory language of the CIC1917 where priests are required to celebrate Mass but rather states that priests should "celebrate frequently" and that daily celebration is "strongly recommended." Thus, while there is no legal obligation for priests to celebrate daily Mass, it is nonetheless strongly recommended.²

20. *IGMR2002* points to the "outward signs" within the eucharistic celebration that "foster, strengthen, and express faith." The purpose of the Eucharist,

2. Foundations for this perspective can be traced back to the early seventeenth century and the Oratory of French Cardinal Pierre de Bérulle (d. 1629)—what came to be known as the "Bérulle School." There, the Eucharistic celebration was established as the center of Catholic piety giving greater prominence to the sacrificial nature of the Mass and the action of the priest within the sacrifice. Thanks to the efforts of the Bérulle School, along with the approaches to piety represented by two of his contemporaries: Condren (d. 1641) and Olier (d. 1657), personal piety and private devotion came to be linked to the celebration of Mass—both for the laity as well as the clergy—albeit in different forms. Consequently, the emphasis on the priest's daily celebration of the Mass found fertile ground there. See Joseph A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, trans. Francis Brunner, 2 vols. (Westminster: Christian Classics, 1986), I:143.

participation and more properly respond to the spiritual needs of the faithful.

21. This Instruction aims both to offer general guidelines for properly arranging the Celebration of the Eucharist and to set forth rules for ordering the various forms of celebration.³²

21. Hæc itaque Institutio eo spectat ut tum lineamenta generalia præbeat, quibus Eucharistiæ celebratio apte ordinetur, tum regulas exponat, quibus singulæ celebrationis formæ disponantur.³²

as with all the sacraments, is the sanctification of the People of God, the spiritual upbuilding of the Body of Christ, and the worship of God “in spirit and in truth” (*CIC1983*, c. 834, par. 1). The sacraments as events are themselves signs that teach and communicate meaning. They nourish the faith of the liturgical assembly and impart grace so that Christians are able to live faithful lives in service of the gospel through their practice of charity (*SC*, no. 59). Already in the fifth century, St. Augustine (d. 430) suggested that we call the Eucharist a “sacrifice” because it is a sacrament or a “sacred sign” (*De civitate Dei*, 10, 5). In his classic *Sacred Signs*, Romano Guardini reminded the Church of how simple, common objects and actions can be bearers of great mystery.³ The liturgy itself is replete with signs whose meanings are only appropriately interpreted by believers within particular cultures (*CEC*, nos. 1145–1148). But these signs will only be able to foster, strengthen, and express faith to the extent that they are understood and appropriated by the celebrating community gathered together by God in a particular time and place.

Soon after the Council, some pastors believed that the most effective way to assist their assemblies in understanding these signs was to explain, even at times to overexplain them. The postconciliar experience along with the rich contribution made by the social sciences, has helped the Church to recognize a fundamental truth: when sacramental signs are properly enacted they communicate on their own behalf. They convey a depth of meaning that transcends verbal expression, and they foster the active and full participation of the whole body of Christ desired by the Church. Thus, pastoral agents are encouraged to make wise use of the forms and elements which the Church provides.

21. This article provides the rationale for why *IGMR2002* is needed in the first place: both to assist proper liturgical planning for celebrations of the Eucharist and also to offer direction for individual celebrations of Mass without a congregation. Liturgy is more than words; it is action whose unity is essential for the effective performance of the ritual. The concept of choreography is quite helpful in discussing ritual. The *Anaphora of Serapion* used the term *choregos*⁴—a term borrowed from Greek theatre—to speak of God as the “choreographer of

3. Romano Guardini, *Sacred Signs*, rev. ed. (Wilmington DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1979).

4. 1.5, see Johannes Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima*, Florilegium Patristicum 7, ed. Bernhard Geyer and Johannes Zellinger (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1935), 60.

22. The celebration of the Eucharist in a particular Church is of utmost importance.

For the diocesan Bishop, the chief steward of the mysteries of God in the particular Church entrusted to his care, is the moderator, promoter, and guardian of the whole of its liturgical life.³³ In celebrations at which the Bishop presides, and especially in the celebration of the Eucharist led by the Bishop himself with the presbyter-

22. Summi autem momenti est Eucharistiæ celebratio in Ecclesia particulari.

Episcopus enim diœcesanus, primus mysteriorum Dei dispensator in Ecclesia particulari sibi commissa, moderator est, promotor et custos totius vitæ liturgicæ.³³ In celebrationibus quæ, ipso præsentente, aguntur, præsertim vero in celebratione eucharistica, quæ ab ipso agitur, presbyterio, diaconis et populo participantibus,

immortality” who essentially leads all of creation in the dance. Analogously, Ignatius of Antioch spoke of the Church as a choir and God as the choir director.⁵ *IGMR2002* suggests a sort of liturgical choreography by which the assembly is able to move together as one body—the mystical body of Christ. It also protects against the idiosyncratic behavior of some presiders evident in the years immediately after the Council. Moving together creates greater harmony and unity within the eucharistic celebration. The Instruction offers ample room for adaptation and flexibility in the celebration, but presidential improvisation beyond what is called for in *IGMR2002* can overburden the ritual and texts and weaken the nonverbal symbolic communication within the action.

In the second century, Justin Martyr’s *First Apology* noted that the president of the Sunday eucharistic assembly should pray the Eucharistic Prayer “according to his ability,”⁶ i.e., to improvise—a necessity in the era preceding the development of liturgical books. By contrast, the sixteenth-century Tridentine liturgical reforms fixed liturgical texts in uniformly printed books, often leading to a slavish preoccupation with rubrics, a preoccupation that lasted four centuries. Happily the liturgical reforms of Vatican II have restored a helpful balance: the rubrics within the *Missale Romanum* maintain the unity of the Roman Rite and help the liturgical ministers in properly fulfilling their tasks, but they are not ends in themselves. When bishops and priests take the time to study carefully *IGMR2002* and become familiar with it, their presidency at the Eucharist has greater potential for being more prayerful and transparent, calling less attention to the presider and more attention to Jesus Christ whose paschal mystery lies at the heart of the celebration.

22. Articles 22 through 26 contain material not in earlier editions of *IGMR*. Article 22 addresses the importance of the eucharistic celebration within the local Church. As shepherd of the flock in that particular church, the diocesan bishop is the “moderator, promoter, and guardian” of the liturgical life within

5. *Phil.*, no. 4, see *Ignace d’Antioche: Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe*, ed. Pierre Camelot, Sources Chrétiennes 10 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969), 122.

6. 67.5, see Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima*, 20.

ate, the deacons, and the people taking part, the mystery of the Church is revealed. For this reason, the solemn celebration of Masses of this sort must be an example for the entire diocese.

The Bishop should therefore be determined that the priests, the deacons, and the lay Christian faithful grasp ever more deeply the genuine meaning of the rites and liturgical texts and thereby be led to an active and fruitful celebration of the Eucharist. To the same end, he should also be vigilant that the dignity of these celebrations be enhanced. In promoting this dignity, the beauty of the sacred place, of music, and of art should contribute as greatly as possible.

mysterium Ecclesiae manifestatur. Quare huiusmodi Missarum sollemnia exemplo esse debent universae diocesi.

Eius ergo est animum intendere ut presbyteri, diaconi et christifideles laici, genuinum sensum rituum et textuum liturgicorum penitus semper comprehendant et ita ad actuosam et fructuosam Eucharistiae celebrationem ducantur. Eundem in finem invigilet ut ipsarum celebrationum dignitas augeatur, ad quam promovendam loci sacri, musicae et artis pulchritudo quamplurimum conferat.

the diocese (*ChrDom*, no.15; *CIC1983* cc. 835, par. 1; 838, par. 1). *SC*, no. 41 quotes Ignatius of Antioch in speaking of the local church gathered together with its bishop in the “same Eucharist, in one prayer, at one altar.”⁷ By implication, the cathedral should be the liturgical model for the diocese, especially in those solemn celebrations at which the bishop himself presides (*CEC*, no. 1561). In the years since the Council increasing numbers of residential bishops have been restoring the ancient tradition of presiding and preaching at the principal Eucharist in their own cathedrals each Sunday morning.

The diocesan bishop should also assist his clergy and the lay faithful to grow in their appreciation of the genuine sense of the liturgical rites themselves, which will then lead them to a more fruitful participation in the eucharistic celebration. *LG* states that “every lawful celebration of the Eucharist is regulated by the bishop” (no. 26). The bishop’s role and responsibility as chief guardian of the diocese’s liturgical life is given even greater emphasis in *Redemptionis Sacramentum* (*RedSac*). In presenting *RedSac*, Cardinal Francis Arinze, the Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, noted:

I single out the role of the Diocesan Bishop. He is the high priest of his flock. He directs, encourages, promotes, and organizes. He looks into sacred music and art. He sets up needed commissions for liturgy, music and sacred art (*RedSac*, nos. 22, 25). He seeks remedies for abuses and it is to him or his assistants that recourse should first be made rather than to the Apostolic See (*RedSac*, nos. 176–182, 184).⁸

7. *Smyrn.*, no. 8; *Magn.*, no. 8; *Phil.*, no. 4, see *Ignace d’Antioche: Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe*, ed. Pierre Camelot, Sources Chrétiennes 10 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969), 138, 84 and 122.

8. “Introducing *Redemptionis Sacramentum*,” Press Conference, 23 April 2004.

23. Moreover, in order that such a celebration may correspond more fully to the prescriptions and spirit of the sacred Liturgy, and also in order to increase its pastoral effectiveness, certain accommodations and adaptations are specified in this General Instruction and in the Order of Mass.

24. These adaptations consist for the most part in the choice of certain rites or texts, that is, of the chants, readings, prayers, explanations, and gestures which may respond better to the needs, preparation, and culture of the participants and which are entrusted to the priest celebrant. Nevertheless, the priest must remember that he is the servant of the sacred Liturgy and that he

23. Quo insuper celebratio praescriptis et spiritui sacrae Liturgiae plenius respondeat, eiusque efficacitas pastoralis augeatur, in hac Institutione generali et in Ordine Missae, aliquae accommodationes et aptationes exponuntur.

24. Hae aptationes, ut plurimum, in electione consistunt quorundam rituum aut textuum, id est cantuum, lectionum, orationum, monitionum et gestuum, qui sint necessitatibus, praeparationi et ingenio participantium magis respondentes quique sacerdoti celebranti committuntur. Attamen meminerit sacerdos se servitorem esse sacrae Liturgiae, sibi quidem proprio

The Cardinal's comments, as *RedSac* itself, suggest that greater emphasis is to be placed on the role of the diocesan bishop, as evidenced in nos. 22–26, perhaps in an attempt to remedy what was considered lacking in the earlier editions of the *IGMR*. Indeed, many who have criticized implementation of the conciliar liturgical reforms have faulted residential bishops who failed to give adequate liturgical guidance and direction to their local churches when they returned home from the Vatican Council. The experience of forty years with the conciliar liturgy and an increased concern over liturgical abuses might offer some explanation for this expanded section on the role of the bishop in the implementation of liturgical norms.

23. This article simply introduces the last four articles of this first chapter, which deal with adaptations. It notes that *IGMR2002* and the *Ordo Missae* establish exactly where pastoral “accommodation or adaptation” is possible within eucharistic celebrations. Such guidelines help to facilitate celebrations that are more pastorally effective while corresponding both to the prescriptions and spirit of the sacred liturgy.

24. In noting where pastoral adaptations are possible in the choice of liturgical music, readings, prayers, introductory comments and gestures, this article recognizes that these choices are left to the presider, commonly in consultation with other parish ministers and musicians who assist him (no. 352 below). The purpose of such adaptations is to align these elements of the Mass to the cultural genius and pastoral needs of the particular celebrating community. The eucharistic celebration is not the personal domain of the priest; rather, he is the servant of the worship and of the people of God assembled for the Church's liturgy. Consequently, it is not within his competence to “add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy” (*SC*, no. 22).

himself is not permitted, on his own initiative, to add, to remove, or to change anything in the celebration of Mass.³⁴

25. In addition, certain adaptations are indicated in the proper place in the Missal and pertain respectively to the diocesan Bishop or to the Conference of Bishops, in accord with the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*³⁵ (cf. nos. 387, 388–393).

in *Missæ celebratione addere, demere aut mutare non licere*.³⁴

25. Insuper in Missali suo loco aptationes quædam innuuntur quæ, iuxta Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia, respective competunt aut Episcopo diocesano aut Conferentiæ Episcoporum³⁵ (cf. infra, nn. 387, 388–393).

25. Aside from the adaptations mentioned in the previous article, any additional adaptations are entrusted either to the residential bishop himself or to the Episcopal Conference (cf. nos. 387 and 388–393 below). The diocesan bishop regulates the manner of concelebration and is to establish norms regarding the function of altar servers and other liturgical ministries, the distribution of Communion under both kinds, and the construction and renovation of churches. This latter task is often delegated to a diocesan liturgical commission if there is one, or an art and environment commission within the diocese entrusted with overseeing the proper implementation of liturgical guidelines in the arrangement of liturgical space.

Other liturgical adaptations requiring a greater level of collaboration on national or regional levels are decided by the episcopal conference. One of their most important tasks is to prepare and approve an edition of the *Missale Romanum* in the vernacular and then submit the proposed text to the Holy See for confirmation (*recognitio*, CIC1983, c. 838, par. 3; also Seasoltz, 37 above). Episcopal conferences within the English-speaking world joined together in 1963 to form the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL), where vernacular translations of the liturgical books are prepared by an international commission of experts. Nonetheless, each particular bishops' conference must independently submit its own liturgical texts for confirmation by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments.

Along with the important task of preparing vernacular translations of the liturgical books, episcopal conferences decide on the adaptations indicated within *IGMR2002* and the *Ordo Missæ*. Those decisions must also be submitted to the Holy See for the normal *recognitio* and once approval has been granted, the episcopal conference is then charged with the task of implementation on the national or regional level. These adaptations include the chant texts in the entrance rite, at the preparation of the gifts, and the Communion; gestures and postures of the faithful (e.g. during the Eucharistic Prayer); the gestures of veneration before the altar and the Book of the Gospels; scriptural readings to be used on special occasions; the manner of exchanging the greeting of peace and Holy Communion; materials used for the altar and liturgical furnishings and sacred vessels; and both the color and form used for liturgical vesture.

26. As for variations and the more substantial adaptations in view of the traditions and culture of peoples and regions, to be introduced in accordance with article 40 of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* because of benefit or need, the norms set forth in the Instruction *On the Roman Liturgy and Inculturation*³⁶ and in nos. 395–399 are to be observed.

26. Quod autem ad varietates et aptationes profundiores attinet, quæ ad traditiones et ingenium populorum et regionum attendant, ad mentem art. 40 Constitutionis de sacra Liturgia pro utilitate vel necessitate introducendas, ea servantur quæ in Instructione « De Liturgia romana et inculturatione »³⁶ et infra, (nn. 395–399) exponuntur.

26. This final article notes that certain pastoral situations will need more substantial cultural adaptation than what has been mentioned above. Such adaptation must take into account “the traditions and culture of peoples and regions.” The article references SC, no. 40 which states: “In some places and circumstances, however, an even more radical adaptation of the liturgy is needed.” An example of “radical adaptation” can be found in the *Roman Missal for the Dioceses of Zaire* approved by the Holy See in 1987. Popularly called the “Zairean (or Congolese) Rite” (cf. no. 78 below), this inculturated form of the Roman Rite includes distinctly Zairean/Congolese ritual elements that reflect the African genius and yet would be out of place in another part of the world. Such adaptations should follow the guidelines as established in SC, no. 40, which begins with the important role played by the episcopal conference in the process.

Article 26 also refers in a footnote to *Varietates Legitimæ*. That 1994 document reflects thirty years of postconciliar experience in the area of liturgical inculturation. As a help to bishops and episcopal conferences, it attempts to respond to problems and situations not envisaged at the time of the Council. Specifically, the document aims to help bishops “to consider or put into effect, according to the law, such adaptations already foreseen in the liturgical books; to re-examine critically arrangements that have already been made; and if, in certain cultures, pastoral need requires that form of adaptation of the liturgy which the Constitution calls ‘more profound’ and at the same time considers ‘more difficult,’ to make arrangements for putting it into effect in accordance with the law” (no. 3).

Finally, the article notes that more profound cultural adaptations to the liturgy will also need to follow guidelines established in *IGMR2002*, nos. 395–399. Among other things, those articles note that the goal of liturgical inculturation is not to create new families of rites but rather to adapt the Roman Rite so that it responds to various cultural needs while maintaining its substantial unity. It cautions against any hasty and incautious manner of liturgical inculturation lest “the authentic liturgical tradition suffer contamination” (*authentica traditio liturgica contaminetur*, no. 398).

Conclusion

Chapter I establishes a framework for *IGMR2002* and lays out basic theological and functional principles, each of which will receive greater attention later in the document. There is little new information here, despite the addition of nos. 22–26 which were not in *IGMR1975*. Perhaps the most significant addition is the emphasis given to the bishop as “moderator, promoter, and guardian” of the diocese’s liturgical life (no. 22) which amplifies c. 835 of *CIC1983*. Concretely, this means that the bishop himself, far from being simply a liturgical disciplinarian, should be an effective model of how to preside at worship, making it his aim to lead the people of his diocese to a deeper appreciation of the liturgy’s riches through beautiful, prayerful, and dignified celebrations.

GIRM—Notes (English)

22. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 41; Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen gentium*, no. 11; Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, nos. 2, 5, 6; Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops, *Christus Dominus*, 28 October 1965, no. 30; Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis redintegratio*, 21 November 1964, no. 15; Sacred Congregation of Rites, Instruction *Eucharisticum mysterium*, On the worship of the Eucharist, 25 May 1967, nos. 3e, 6: AAS 59 (1967), pp. 542, 544–545.

23. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 10.

24. Cf. *ibid.*, no. 102.

25. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 10; cf. Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, no. 5.

26. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, nos. 14, 19, 26, 28, 30.

27. Cf. *ibid.*, no. 47.

28. Cf. *ibid.*, no. 14.

29. Cf. *ibid.*, no. 41.

30. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, no. 13; *Codex Iuris Canonici*, can. 904.

IGMR—Notes (Latin)

22. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 41; Const. dogm. de Ecclesia, *Lumen gentium*, n. 11; Decr. de Presbyterorum ministerio et vita, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, nn. 2, 5, 6; Decr. de pastorali Episcoporum munere, *Christus Dominus*, n. 30; Decr. de Œcumenismo, *Unitatis redintegratio*, n. 15; S. CONGR. RITUUM, Instr. *Eucharisticum mysterium*, diei 25 maii 1967, nn. 3 e, 6: A.A.S. 59 (1967) pp. 542, 544–545.

23. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 10.

24. Cf. *ibidem*, n. 102.

25. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 10; Decr. de Presbyterorum ministerio et vita, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, n. 5.

26. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, nn. 14, 19, 26, 28, 30.

27. Cf. *ibidem*, n. 47.

28. Cf. *ibidem*, n. 14.

29. Cf. *ibidem*, n. 41.

30. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Decr. de Presbyterorum ministerio et vita, *Presbyterorum ordinis*, n. 13; *Codex Iuris Canonici*, can. 904.

31. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 59.

32. Special celebrations of Mass should observe the guidelines established for them: For Masses with special groups, cf. Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, Instruction *Actio pastoralis*, On Masses with special groups, 15 May 1969: AAS 61 (1969), pp. 806–811; for Masses with children, cf. Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, *Directory for Masses with Children*, 1 November 1973: AAS 66 (1974), pp. 30–46; for the manner of joining the Hours of the Office with the Mass, cf. Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, *General Instruction of the Liturgy of the Hours, editio typica*, 11 April 1971, *editio typica altera*, 7 April 1985, nos. 93–98; for the manner of joining certain blessings and the crowning of an image of the Blessed Virgin Mary with the Mass, cf. The Roman Ritual, *Book of Blessings, editio typica*, 1984, Introduction, no. 28; *Order of Crowning an Image of the Blessed Virgin Mary, editio typica*, 1981, nos. 10 and 14.

33. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops, *Christus Dominus*, no. 15; cf. also Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 41.

34. Cf. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 22.

35. Cf. also Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, nos. 38, 40; Paul VI, Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*.

36. Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, Instruction *Varietates legitimæ*, 25 January 1994: AAS 87 (1995), pp. 288–314.

31. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 59.

32. Quoad peculiare Missæ celebrationes servetur quod statutum est: cf. pro Missis in cœtibus particularibus: S. CONGR. PRO CULTU DIVINO, Instr. *Actio pastoralis*, diei 15 maii 1969: A.A.S. 61 (1969) pp. 806–811; pro Missis cum pueris: *Directorium de Missis cum pueris*, diei 1 novembris 1973: A.A.S. 66 (1974) pp. 30–46; de modo uniendi Horas Officii cum Missa: *Institutio generalis de Liturgia Horarum*, nn. 93–98; de modo uniendi quasdam benedictiones et coronationem imaginis beatæ Mariæ Virginis cum Missa: RITUALE ROMANUM, *De Benedictionibus*, Prænotanda, n. 28; *Ordo coronandi imaginem beatæ Mariæ Virginis*, nn. 10 et 14.

33. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Decr. de pastorali Episcoporum munere, *Christus Dominus*, n. 15; cf. etiam Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 41.

34. Cf. CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 22.

35. Cf. etiam CONC. ŒCUM. VAT. II, Const. de sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, nn. 38, 40; PAULUS VI, Const. Ap. *Missale Romanum*, supra.

36. CONGR. DE CULTU DIVINO ET DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM, Instr. *Varietates legitimæ*, diei 25 ianuarii 1994: A.A.S. 87 (1995) pp. 288–314.